



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



44. 1075.







A BRIEF
STATEMENT
OF
THE UNITARIAN DOCTRINE,
In a Letter addressed to the Editor of the Kent Magazine;
TO WHICH IS ADDED
A further Correspondence occasioned by his Stricture thereon ;
AND THE
UNITARIAN INTERPRETATION OF THE TEXT,
“ Baptize in the name of the Father, and of the
“ Son, and of the Holy Ghost :”
TOGETHER WITH SOME
OBSERVATIONS
ON THE NATURE OF THE JEWISH SACRIFICES,
AND ON THE
Doctrine of the Atonement.
CONCLUDING WITH A FEW
REMARKS
ON THE DIVINITY OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST,
As distinguished from his Deity.

PRINCIPALLY A COMPILATION

BY DENSYLI.

ROCHESTER,

PRINTED BY CADDEL AND SON.

1844.

Christianity has offered itself to man's acceptance by an appeal to his reason and judgment ; appeals so strong, that the rejection of them is necessarily vicious, and therefore deserving of punishment. What ! though superstition on the one hand, and enthusiasm on the other,—the one by closing the avenues of reason, the other by appealing to inward and visionary inspirations, have both rendered Christianity unreasonable, still the Saviour of the world reasoned surely, when he appealed to his works as a test of his authority and mission. The Bereans surely reasoned when Paul applauded ; and he has ordered us to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.

What then becomes of the charge that Christianity has nothing to do with reason ; the unblushing renewal of which seems to call for a repetition of its exposures ? Like a thousand others, directed against the same object, it will not bear the touch ; but crumble at once, when handled, into dust and nothingness. The Religion, which is our guide and our hope, expects no blind irrational credulity from its votaries. Conscious of her strength, she courts examination ; for she has built her house on the rock of truth.—(*Vide British Critic for March, 1821.*)

A
BRIEF STATEMENT,

&c. &c.

No fact is more notorious, than that the religious opinions of the Unitarian Christians are grossly misrepresented, and which arises in numerous instances from the most palpable ignorance and prejudice : and the opposition they experience from others, it may be well apprehended, is called forth by motives of a less pure and worthy nature. Whatever, therefore, was the object of the Editor of the Kent Magazine, in publishing in his first number, a most unwarrantable and unjust attack on the Unitarians, is best known to himself ; but, at all events, it excites a suspicion, that he was actuated by views not altogether free from a personal and interested nature.

Although the Editor professed to have been educated on *liberal* principles, he commenced his career as an Author, by inserting the following *illiberal* sentence in a letter, which he addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury :—" There are some " Infidels among us, who to avoid the odious name of Atheists, " would shelter and screen themselves, under the new name of " Deists or Unitarians."

In consequence, therefore, of this unjust and calumnious remark, ' Densyl¹ ' addressed a letter to the Editor of the Kent Magazine, having for its object, a defence of the Unitarian doctrine, which was published in the number for June 1824, with the Editor's stricture thereon. This led to a further correspondence, which is contained in this miscellany.

To the Editor of the Kent Magazine.

SIR,—In your address to the Inhabitants of Kent, inserted in your first number, you state that the Magazine will be “ distinguished for the uniformity of its excellence, and for the candour “ which will at all times be manifested.” I regret, however, that in your first publication, you should have departed from the principles of candour, and have resorted to those of misrepresentation, by inserting the following observation in your Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury :—“ There are some Infidels “ among us, who, to avoid the odious name of Atheists, would “ shelter and screen themselves under the new name of Deists or “ Unitarians.” But, as I am not disposed to believe that you would wilfully be guilty of a misrepresentation, and that you have denominated the Unitarians, Deists, or Atheists, under an erroneous impression of their religious opinions, I will beg to state what I believe they are, in the hope that the principles of candour on which you profess to act, will induce you to insert this Letter in your next number, so that publicity may be given thereto, with the view to remove the impression your representation may have made on the minds of your readers, that the Unitarian doctrine is Atheistical and Antichristian.

The Unitarian Christians believe that Jesus is the Christ ;* that he is that prophet, whom Moses, as recorded in the 18th chap. of Deut. foretold should be raised—that he was divinely inspired to reveal the will of God to mankind—that he had the power to work miracles in attestation of the Divinity of his mission—that after his death and resurrection he ascended into heaven—and that he is the Mediator between God and man. And as a proof that their doctrine is in unison with the Sacred Writings, I refer you to the Evangelist John, who assures us, *that whosoever believes Jesus to be the Christ is born of God ;* and to St. Paul, who says, *that if thou shalt with thy mouth confess the Lord Jesus, and shall believe in thy heart, that God*

* Our Saviour should uniformly be designated the Christ—Jesus being his name, and Christ his office—from the Greek word—Christos, to anoint.

has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. This being the belief of the Unitarian Christians, surely it is illiberal, unjust, and uncandid in the extreme, to stigmatize them with such reproachful and odious epithets, as Infidels and Atheists. And perhaps, you are not aware, that of all the sects into which the Christian world is divided, not one can be produced, the members of which, more strenuously maintain the Divine Mission of Jesus, or more ardently and successfully oppose the unbeliever. This praise, even some of their most determined adversaries allow, that to Unitarian writers, the public is indebted for some of the ablest works, in defence of the Divine origin and authority of Christianity.

Permit me to hope, that whenever you may again have occasion to animadvert on the religious opinions of others, you will bear in mind, and be actuated by the benevolent and truly Christian sentiments of that highly esteemed and respected Metropolitan to whom you addressed your Letter; who, on the 21st May, 1812, on the motion of Lord Sidmouth, relative to the Protestant Dissenters said, that "However he might lament what he conceived to be the errors of the Protestant Dissenters, it was to be recollected, that the Bible was the foundation of their religious belief, as well as that of the Established Church, and was, or might be, in the hands of every member of the empire: and it was to be recollected, that the best of interpretations, were but the interpretations of men, and that the best of men were liable to err."

I cannot conclude this Letter without assuring you, that I am not opposed to the discipline of the Church of England. Nevertheless I cannot avoid declaring, that I should feel much rejoiced, were her Creeds to undergo a revision, particularly that which is ascribed to St. Athanasius, but which is now generally supposed to have been written by Vigilius Tapsensis, a Latin writer of no credit, about the latter end of the fifth century.

I am, &c.

13th May, 1824.

‘DENSYLI.’

Stricture on the above.

The Letter of our Unitarian correspondent does honour to the goodness of his intentions. He feels, as he ought to do, for the reputation of the society to which he belongs, and expresses himself in the warmest language of his passions. Our former remarks to the Archbishop, have not only discomposed his gravity; but, we believe, have affected the tranquillity of his conscience. Reader! examine your own heart, and you will discover, that enquiries and even reproaches, have no power to disturb, either the man of unblemished integrity, or the abandoned profligate. It is the middle compound character, that alone is vulnerable: the man, who without firmness enough, to avoid a dishonourable action, has feeling enough to be ashamed of it.

We come to the test. Our correspondent refers us to a number of particulars contained in the Creed of the Unitarian, which proves nothing to the purpose,—he maintains propositions that are not disputed, advanced to perplex the minds of our readers, to lose sight of the main question, without arriving at the truth. He professes a candour which he has not exemplified. Why not speak plainly—why not boldly say, he disbelieves the doctrines which our Church scripturally holds to be most sacred—why not acknowledge a disbelief in the eternal divinity of Jesus, and expose the folly of faith in the Atonement. We appeal to the test. Does not Mahomet believe as much as the Unitarians? Nay more. If salvation be obtained only through a living faith in the blood of the eternal Covenant, which has been sealed by Christ, what advantage has the Unitarian over the Mahometan, the Deist, or the Infidel? We use plain language; but we use it with propriety. The same definition of Unitarianism will be found in Todd's edition of Johnson, that we gave in our Letter to the Archbishop,—we have no disposition to uncharitable remark.

Our Saviour commands his disciples to “baptize in the name “of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” This text we hold to be sufficient to establish the eternal Divinity of Christ,

and to make the doctrine of the Trinity an evident and essential part of Scripture, though the numberless passages usually adduced were obscure.

We admit, that there are doctrines contained in the Bible, which are not expressed with the greatest degree of evidence and clearness, of which words are capable ; but we insist, that the doctrines are so expressed, that, an impartial and well-meaning man cannot mistake them, and indeed had all points of doctrine been delivered with the greatest degree of correctness, there are men, who would have found a way to have mistaken, or rather wilfully to have perverted them.

In fine,—God never designed to give us an account of the mysteries of Christianity, in expressions so clear, to prevent all possibility of misconstruction—this had been too great a force to our assent, which ought to be free and voluntary—this had been to rob us of the rewards due to our faith, and to take from us the proof and trial of our sincerity.

There is scarce any thing so absurd, says an ancient, in nature and morality, but some philosopher or other has held it. And we may say, there is scarce any thing so extravagant in divinity, but, that some obstinate opinative man has maintained it, and endeavoured to countenance his opinion by the authority of Scripture, which he has miserably wrested and perverted to his purpose. But what does this prove? as much as the wild opinion of that old philosopher, who affirmed snow to be black, disproves the certainty of those informations which proceed from the senses.

Let not the Unitarian say, the Scripture is not plain in the doctrines we profess, because the Church has understood them one way, and Arius, Socinus, or some other broachers of heresy another ; this only proves, that there have been men hardy enough to deny that which all the world before them allowed, and this, perhaps, with by-designs of heading a party, or baffling received opinions. We require nothing more of the Unitarians, but to leave us in possession of our Bibles, till they can shew us a clearer revelation,—one more worthy of the divine revealer.

THE EDITOR.

To the Editor of the Kent Magazine.

SIR,—I beg you will accept my thanks for inserting in your second number the letter which I addressed to you on the 13th ult., because I hope its contents will tend to convince every unprejudiced mind, that notwithstanding your stricture thereon, it is an act of great injustice and illiberality to class the Unitarian Christians with Atheists and Diests, the former denying the existence of a God, and the latter, followers of no particular religion, acknowledging only the existence of the Deity : whereas the Unitarians are firm believers in the Divine Mission of Jesus—that he is the Christ, and the Mediator between God and man ; and confessing him as did his own inspired disciples,—“ The Apostle and High Priest of their profession.”

In reply to your Strictures on my letter, believe me, when I assure you, that your remarks to the Archbishop did not “ discompose my gravity, neither did they affect the tranquillity of my conscience,”—they only excited my regret, that in the nineteenth century, an individual professing to have been educated on liberal principles, should evince sentiments, when writing on a theological subject, not consonant thereto.

With regard to your enquiry, why I did not “ expose the folly of faith in the Atonement”—permit me to observe, that I had no desire when I addressed you, to make any comments, or to question the truth of any of the doctrines of the Church of England ; my only object being to rescue a class of individuals from that obloquy and reproach, which the observations contained in your letter, tended to fix on them ; and whom, from my knowledge of their religious opinions, do not deserve to be stigmatized with such epithets, as—Atheists ! Deists ! and Infidels !—because after an examination of the Sacred Writings, the doctrines they profess, they firmly and conscientiously believe to be those that were taught by Christ and his Apostles. And I am sure you must be impressed with a conviction, that harsh and reproachful language, furnish no evidence whatever, that the cause against which it is directed, is not the cause of truth, of righteousness, and of God.

To establish the eternal divinity of Christ, and in order to make it appear that the doctrine of the Trinity is an evident and essential part of Scripture, you quote our Saviour's commands to his disciples, to "*baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*" I regret that the explanation given of this passage by the Unitarians, is much too long for a Letter to be inserted in your Miscellany. I will, therefore, only observe, that they interpret this text in a manner consonant to their hypothesis.* And indeed, there is scarcely a text usually, advanced by Trinitarian writers in support of their opinions that has not been considered by Unitarians as applicable to their doctrine—and that to, without being "miserably wrested and perverted to the purpose."

You observe—"Let not the Unitarian say, the Scripture is not plain in those doctrines we profess, because the Church understood them one way, and Arius, Socinus, or some other broacher of heresy another; this only proves, that there have been men hardy enough to deny that which *all the world before them allowed.*" By this observation you evidently imply, that the universal belief of Christians, antecedent to the days of Arius and Socinus, was that, which is now professed by those denominated the Orthodox; but, from the following remarks, it will surely appear, that you are incorrect in your conclusion.

That the common people among Christians were actually Unitarians in the early ages, and believed nothing of the pre-existence or divinity of the person of Christ, before the Council of Nice, surely we have as express a testimony as can be desired in the case. These sublime doctrines were thought to be above their comprehension, and to be capable of being understood by the learned only. This we see most clearly in the general strain of the writings of Origen, who was himself a firm defender of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ.

Athanasius and Tertullian acknowledged that the Unitarian doctrine was very prevalent among the lower class of people in

* For the Unitarian interpretation of this passage vide page 30.

their time. Athanasius calls them the *many*, and describes them as persons of low understandings : " it grieves," he says, " those who stand up for the Holy Faith, that the *multitude*, and especially persons of low understandings, should be infected by those blasphemies. Things that are sublime and difficult, are not to be apprehended except by faith ; and ignorant people must fall, if they cannot be persuaded to rest in faith, and avoid curious questions."

Now, one proof of the *antiquity* of a doctrine is its being found among the common people, in preference to the learned, the former being least, and the latter most apt to innovate ; so that from the doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ, being held by the common people in the time of Tertullian, Origen, and Athanasius, it may reasonably be concluded, that it was the doctrine they had received from their ancestors, and that it originated with the Apostles themselves.

It is acknowledged by the early writers of the Orthodox persuasion, that two kinds of heresies existed in the time of the Apostles, namely, that of those who held that Christ was simply a man, and that of the Gnostics. Now, the Apostle John, animadverted with the greatest severity upon the latter, but makes no mention of the former ; and can it be thought probable that he would pass it without censure, if he had thought it an error, considering how great and how dangerous an error it has always been thought by those, who have considered it as being an error at all ?

The hypothesis that John having taught the Divinity of Christ in the introduction of his Gospel, does not occur in the earliest writers, those being nearest to the source of information, say that John had a view to the Gnostics only, both in his Epistles, and the introduction to his Gospel. This was the opinion of Irenæus, who wrote about the year 170. The first writer who says that John meant the Unitarians, I believe was Origen, who wrote about the year 254.

It is also admitted by Mosheim, and similar writers, that there were in the first century those who denied the miraculous

conception of Christ, and held that he became superior to other men at his baptism, when the power necessary for the purposes of his mission were bestowed ; and that they were not a distinct body till the second century. This fact is important. If not a distinct body from other Christians, they must have been the great body of Christians ; for if the Divinity of the person of Christ was the original doctrine, and the worship of Christ the original practice, those who denied the one, and withheld the other, could not have remained in fellowship with others. They must have been promptly expelled, as they invariably have been, since Trinitarianism gained the ascendancy ; that they continued so long in the Church is alone a demonstration of their superiority in point of numbers, of the antiquity of their faith, and the novelty of the tenets to which it was opposed. Justin Martyr, in the second century, advances his notion of the super-humanity of Christ with the tone and manner of an innovator. Tertullian describes the greater part of the believers in his time, as dreading the doctrine of the Trinity, and strictly adhering to the sole monarchy of God. Origen speaks of the multitude of Christians as not knowing the mystery of the Logos. And if we look into the Gospel history we shall find that all our Saviour taught, or insinuated, were his divine mission in general, or his being the Messiah in particular ; with the doctrine of the resurrection, and that of himself coming again to judge the world : these doctrines accompanied with moral instructions and reproof of the Pharisees for corrupting the Law of God, made up the whole of his preaching.

The end that Christianity professedly aims at, is the spiritual improvement of mankind, the present virtue and comfort, and the future perfection and happiness of all who yield themselves to its powers. It keeps this end continually in view ; it represents all its doctrines and all its precepts as means of promoting this end ; it is careful to set them in that attitude in which they most directly and powerfully contribute to it. Christians have not always considered the Gospel in this light ; they have not searched it with a design only to find food by which their souls

may be-nourished unto eternal life; but they have sought for what may gratify their curiosity, give an occasion for displaying the ingenuity, or countenance refinements into which they had previously run : and, while they were intent in drawing from the Gospel imaginary benefits, which it was never designed to afford, they have too often lost sight of the real and important advantages of which it is naturally productive. A misapprehension of the proper and ultimate end of Christianity, and a desire, consequent on that misapprehension, of applying it to purposes remote from its intention, is the source to which we may trace up most of the subtle and intricate discussions imposed on the world, in all ages, as the doctrines of Christ, and most of the frivolous, and abstruse controversies, which have been agitated as questions very essential to Religion.

The great object of the Christian Religion is the moral care and the moral cultivation of man. *All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do you even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets.* The Redeemer taught men to look and rely on their works for salvation, and confirmed this doctrine, by this most plain and most impressive declaration :— *For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of the Father with his Angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works.* It is, therefore, manifest, when that awful and solemn period shall arrive, the inquiry will not be, whether we believed in articles, and confessions of faith and doctrine, drawn up by fallible men ; but how, and in what manner we acted that part, we were destined to perform in the drama of human life. In fact, the sole end of religion, is the love of God and one's neighbour ; this comprehends all virtue, and there is no mystery in it whatever.

As you remarked in your Stricture on my former Letter, that I had professed a candour which I had not exemplified, I must admit, that whatever may be the conviction of my mind, on a further examination of this important subject, at present, to the doctrines of the Church of England, I cannot conscientiously assent. At the same time I hope, you will not evince a

disposition to an uncharitable remark, when I declare my acquiescence in the sentiments of Archbishop Tillotson, in wishing "we were well rid" of the Creed ascribed to Athanasius ; but which is generally supposed to have been written—as I observed in my former letter—by Vigilus Tapsensis, a Latin writer of no credit, about the latter end of the fifth century.

I am, &c.

10th June, 1824.

'DENSYLI.'

Answer to the above.

Infidelity, in all its gradations, from Socinism to Atheism itself, originates in the same corrupt source, the pride, the carnality, and the enmity of the human heart. We have not taken up our pen to avoid the intricacies of criticism, but to make a distinct appeal to the Scriptures, to the Fathers, to the judgment, to the conscience, and to the heart ; in order to shew our readers that correct views respecting the person of Christ, and the design of his death, form an essential part of the Christian's faith. To view the Messiah, who is revealed as a Saviour, as a mere prophet, or as possessed of the nature of the Godhead ; or whether his death is to be considered as merely a testimony of the truth of his doctrines, or as making an Atonement to Divine Justice, for the sins of the whole world ; manifestly involve two systems which require our most serious examination,—because they are totally opposite, the one being true, and the other false, the one tending to eternal life, and the other to everlasting death.

That Jesus Christ is truly and properly God, St. John observes—*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God.** And St. Paul saith—*Of whom, as concerning the*

* Mr. Mardon, a Unitarian Minister of considerable eminence, in his letter addressed to the Rev. Baptist Noel, denominated 'Christianity identified with Unitarianism,' says, the second example in which you think the Dicty of Christ is held forth with

flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. And Timothy—*Without controversy great is the mystery of Godliness. God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, and received up into glory.* And St. Matthew, and the Prophet Isaiah—*Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and shall bring forth a Son, and thou shall call his name Emmanuel, i. e. God with us.* That Christ is eternal, St. John remarks—*Fear not, I am the first and the last ; I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore. Amen.* That he was self-existent—*Lo, I am with you always, &c.* Christ declares his own omnipotence—I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord, who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty. Omniscience is ascribed to Christ *Peter saith unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things.* To this Christ made no reply ; and therefore admits it, in its full latitude. Had it not been true, he would not have

“peculiar plainness and force of language,” is the celebrated Introduction to the Gospel of St. John, which I shall copy, with an alteration of orthography only, from the first English translation—that of the Protestant martyr Tyndal, which, if you have not examined it, you may be surprised to find fatal to the argument which you found upon this portion of Scripture.

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God,
 “All things were made by it, and without it was made nothing
 “that was made. In it was life, and the life was the Light of
 “Men, and the light shineth in the darkness, but the darkness
 “comprehended it not ; and the Word was made flesh, and dwelt
 “among us, and we saw the Glory of it, as the Glory of the only
 “begotten Son of the Father, which Word was full of grace and
 “verity.”

In thus connecting neuter pronouns with the term *Word* in this passage, agree, I believe, all the English versions (including the Bishops' Bible, and that published at Geneva), which preceded King James's, is common use. And here our translators have not altered for the better. They seemed to have found a proof for the Deity of Christ wanting ; and accordingly they invented one. The Apostle John is entirely innocent of any such attempt to confound the person of his Lord and Master with that of the only true God ; and has furnished us, as it appears to me, in the opening of his first Epistle, with a key to interpret the commencement of his Gospel, which it requires nothing but a freedom from party bias to enable the Christian to use.

allowed Peter to continue in so dangerous an error. *He is also Omnipotent and Immutable. When two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.* In Scripture, all the peculiar actions of God, are ascribed to Christ. The creation of all things:—*By him were all things made; and without him was not even one thing made which hath been made.* The preservation of all things—*By him* (i. e. Christ) *do all things exist.* The government of all things is, in the same distinct manner applied to Christ—*Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.* The act of giving and restoring life with the forgiveness of sins are also expressly ascribed to him—*Lazarus come forth. Forbearing one another and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any, even as Christ forgave you.* The act of giving eternal life, and of acquitting and condemning Angels and men, is ascribed to Christ—*My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish. The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.*

We might go on to shew all the relations which God sustains to his creatures are in the Scriptures ascribed to Christ, and the divine worship to him is required, and have been, by persons inspired, actually rendered; but our limits will not allow. The Socinian scheme, which represents Christ, at most, as a subordinate God, who came into the world merely as a Prophet and example of righteousness, places man in a woful condition. The actual transgression of man is obnoxious to Divine wrath, and nothing short of Divine interposition in man's behalf could possibly save men from eternal death. Sin is of an infinite nature, because committed against an infinite Creator, and to render the attribute of Divine Justice consonant to the Divine Perfections, man who is a *finite* being, was incapable of paying the demand to justice for transgression,—this satisfaction was made by one who was *infinite*—the Atonement was made by Christ,

God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and of a Sin-offering—He loved us, as St. Paul observes, and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins : and not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world. The Scriptures are full of instances that Christ became the propitiation of sin by his death : Rom., 5 and 6, *In due time Christ died for the ungodly.* 1 Cor., 15 3, *Christ died for our Sins according to the Scriptures.* 2 Cor., 5, 14, *One died for all.* 1 John, 1, 7, *The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin.* 1 Peter, 1, 18 and 19, *Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious blood of Christ.* More proofs on this point to convince any reasonable man cannot be necessary. We regret that our limits will not allow us to go into the question with the Fathers upon the subject of Christ's Divinity to that extent we could wish. We would refer our readers to a work written by the illustrious Bishop Bull ; he has proved with the fullest evidence, that the Fathers who lived before the Council of Nice, did maintain that Christ existed before his birth, that he was of the same essence with the Father, and that he subsisted with him from all eternity.*

Let it be remembered, in order to answer the objections of *Petuvius* and others, who may appear opposed to our thesis, that the same general solution must be admitted, which we oppose to objections extracted from the Scriptures. Passages of Scripture are opposed to us, in which Christ speaks of himself as a *mere man* ; but this makes nothing against us. Jesus

* Bishop Bull confesses, that "*In the first and best ages, the Churches of Christ directed all their Prayers, according to the Scripture, to God only through the alone mediation of Jesus Christ.*" See his answer to the Bishop of Meaux. And he further says, "*That in the Clementine Liturgy, which contained the order of worship before the time of the Emperor Constantine, all the Prayers are directed to God, in the name of his Son Jesus Christ.*"

According to Bishop Bull's confession, it must, therefore, be surely admitted that the early Christians did not entertain the doctrine of the Trinity ; for the worship which they professed, agreeably to the Bishop's own statement, was that, which has always been in strict conformity, to the Unitarian Doctrine.

Christ is both God and man. We can no more conclude, that he is not God, because the Holy Spirit sometimes speaks of him as a man, than we can conclude, that he is not man, because he speaks of himself sometimes as God. Our readers will be better able to apply these observations, if they were to turn to the 8th Book of Origen, against Celsus, where Origen, though a firm believer in the divinity of Christ, observes—"There have been many among the multitude of the faithful, some who, departing from the sentiments received by others, have rashly affirmed that Jesus Christ was God over all creatures. In truth, we who believe the word of the Son, who said, *the Father is greater than I*, do not believe this proposition." We must take care, not to lay down for a principle, that the Fathers always expressed themselves justly, that their words were always the most proper, to convey adequate ideas of their sentiments, that their thesis, in some pages of their writings, did not contradict their thesis in other pages. The sense of a passage in Origen, or Tertullian, divides the learned. May we not, therefore, believe that Origen and Tertullian, in other respects great men, had not at all times distinct ideas of what they meant to express, and did not always rightly understand themselves; no writer is more clear in behalf of the divinity of Christ, than Tertullian, for he observes—"Jesus Christ had the substance of the human nature, and the substance of the divine nature; on which account we say, he had a beginning, and he had no beginning: he was natural and spiritual; weak and powerful; mortal and immortal; properties which distinguish his human and divine nature." Hypolitus, the martyr, also observes, speaking of Christ—"Thou art he who always existed. Thou art with the Father without beginning, and eternal as well as the Holy Spirit." Again, Origen tells us—"Jesus Christ, who, being God, became incarnate, did not cease to be God." Justin Martyr, speaks with equal force—"They call us Atheists, because we do not adore their demons. We grant we are such with regard to their Gods; but not in regard to the true God, with whom we honour and worship the Son." Attend

also to Pope Felix—"We believe Jesus Christ the Word, is the eternal Son of God." In fine, the primitive Christians adored Christ ;—see Pliny's Letter, which says—"They sang hymns to Jesus Christ, as to a God." See Justin Martyr, who, in his apology to Antoninus, expressly says—"Christians religiously worship Father, Son, and Spirit." And, in the same apology, he assures us, that, "the constant doctrines of Christians, which they received from Jesus Christ himself, was the adoration of the one only God." See that faithful letter of the faithful at Smyrna, whom the heathens accused of paying divine honours to Polycarp. "It is impossible,"—says the believers—"that we should abandon Jesus Christ, or worship any other but him. We worship Jesus Christ, who is the Son of God; but, in regard to the martyrs, disciples of Christ, and imitators of his virtues, we respect them for their invincible love to their Master and King." The subject might be further exemplified from the conduct of the Jews towards our Lord, but our limits will not allow.

Let us now ask, if Christ be not in the strictest sense God—where is to be found a propitiation for sin? We are all transgressors of the moral law, and the Unitarian tells us, that the Scriptures reveal to us the doctrine of immortality more clearly than ever it was known before, and adds, that they contain a system of the purest morality; but what consolation can this impart, if it be a morality I have not in every iota practised? The more enlarged my views are of the moral law, the greater will be the claims of the righteous Governor, and the greater will be my condemnation in violating it, unless I can discover how my guilt is to be removed. I find a revelation to be necessary,—it is given, and just so much is revealed concerning my Saviour, as is useful to me to know. To use the language of Dwight, this truth is derived with absolute certainty from the wisdom and goodness of God. Whatever is revealed by this wisdom and goodness; and whatever is withheld, is by the same wisdom and goodness withheld. That which is revealed, we are required by the authority of God to believe; and are

bound to have no reference in our faith to that which is withheld. Whatever mysteries may be inferred from the things actually revealed, can in no manner affect them, and ought in no manner to affect our faith in them. All that is taught is exactly true, and ought to be faithfully believed, although all that is true is not taught, nor capable of being divined by such weak minds as ours.

This revelation takes man where it finds him, and in a state of sin and ruin, condemned by the law of God to final perdition, and incapable of justification by his own righteousness. In this situation it announces a Saviour, divinely great, assuming human nature, to become an expiation for the sins of the world; revealing to man the way to reconciliation to God, and inviting mankind to embrace it and be saved. The acceptance of this expiation is announced from the mouth of God himself. The terms on which we may be reconciled are disclosed with exact precision and perfect clearness. Faith in the Redeemer,—repentance towards God, and holiness of character, involve them all.

2d July, 1824.

THE EDITOR.

To the Editor of the Kent Magazine.

SIR,—I regret, as you profess to have been educated on liberal principles, that you should in your reply to my letter of the 10th June, and which reply was inserted in your Miscellany for this month, commence your observations, by quoting in your first sentence, the remarks of the Editor of the *Evangelical Magazine*, published in the number of that work for July; such sentiments confirming the belief, that there is a tendency to bigotry and intolerance in the minds of those, who profess the doctrines of Calvin. And when it is obvious, that harsh and reproachful language, furnish no evidence whatever, that the cause against which it is directed, is not the cause of truth,—it is really surprising that any person possessed of common judgment should

have recourse to it ; for surely if we are desirous to convince our opponents of the fallacy of their tenets, we are more likely to be successful, by conducting our arguments with temper and moderation.

It is not my intention to enter into an examination of the various quotations you have made in support of your hypothesis, being impressed with a conviction, that my statement, that the common people among Christians in the early ages, were actually Unitarians, and believed nothing of the pre-existence and divinity of the person of Christ—and which constituted the principal subject of my letter—remains unrefuted, and uncontradicted by your observations.

I will, however, remark, in reply to three of your quotations, that the reading, according to Griesbach's edition, of the 16th verse of the 3d chapter of Timothy—instead of *God* manifest in the flesh, is, “ *Who* was manifest in the flesh.” And in the 1st chapter of Revelations, 8th verse, the words—*the beginning and ending*—and, in the 11th verse, the words—*I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last*—are omitted by that learned expositor, by which it will appear, there is an important variation from the received text. And when it is asserted, by some of the most learned divines of the present day—and among them, the celebrated Dr. Marsh, Bishop of Peterborough—who have announced Griesbach's edition of the New Testament, the most perfect extant, it must surely be admitted, that the public version, is not altogether, a faithful translation of the original.

But even admitting that the received text is correct, with reference to the 3d of Timothy, although the word *God* is now used to denote true and proper Deity, this was not always the case. In the sacred Writings, the name *God* is frequently given to creatures, as well as to the Supreme Being. Moses is called *God* ; the Judges of Israel were called *Gods* ; they were called *Gods*, to whom the word of *God* came. Exodus, 7 c 1 v. Psalms, 82 c. 6 v. John, 10 c. 35 v. Hence it is evident, that the word simply by no means describes a particular nature, but is expressive of a peculiar office or relation. When applied to

the Supreme Being, other terms are frequently connected with it, to describe His character and perfections. He is called, Jehovah God—the Most High God—the Almighty God—the Only Wise God—the Invisible God, &c., titles never applied to any other being. If the term God by itself expressed true and proper Deity, the addition of other terms, to distinguish the Most-High from other beings, would be superfluous. Could it be shewn that Christ is called God, ever so frequently in Scripture, it would not hence follow, that he is the Supreme Being, any more than Moses being called God, proves *him* the Supreme Being; or, than the Judges of Israel, being called Gods, prove them all to be possessed of true and proper Deity. He may be a God by office, yet not by nature, by the appointment of the Father, yet not be absolutely supreme. The name denotes government and dominion, and as the government is on the shoulder of Christ, he is constituted Lord of all.

The prophecy of Isaiah, to which you have referred, and which is inserted, as a genuine portion of the Gospel of St. Matthew, in all the versions now extant—with the exception of the ‘Improved Version,’ is, in the opinion of many learned men, exclusively applied to Hezekiah, the son of Ahaz, figuratively designated, as the Son of the Virgin, the Daughter of Zion, to wit, Jerusalem, foretold by the Prophet, as the deliverer of the City from the hands of its enemies, though its utter destruction was then threatened by the Kings of Syria and Israel. The words ‘a Virgin’—according to the Received Text—are, ‘*the Virgin*’ in the original Hebrew, and in the Greek of the Septuagint, and was so translated in the English Bibles, prior to the reign of James I. But unless Ahaz was aware of the allusion of the Prophet, the use of the definite article in this passage must be quite inexplicable; and no one will contend for a moment, that it was given to that wicked King, to understand that the mother of Jesus the Christ, was the person alluded to;—what then could Ahaz have comprehended by the expression ‘the Virgin?’ On referring to 2 Kings, 19 c., 21 v., we find the same Prophet makes use of the very expression, when he informs

the King, *Hezekiah*, of the denunciation of God against Sennacherib, the blasphemous King of Assyria, who was at that time besieging Jerusalem. "This is the word the Lord hath spoken concerning him; *the Virgin*, the Daughter of Zion, hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn." It is impossible to conceive that these words, expressly spoken of the King of Assyria, bear any allusion to the mother of Jesus; and it illustrates clearly the otherwise obscure expression of the Prophet addressed to Ahaz, when he foretold to him, the happy reign of his successor Hezekiah. In Isaiah, 10 c., 32 v., "He (the King of Assyria) shall shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem." The epithet 'the daughter' of Zion, which in the last passage, was used as synonymous with 'the Virgin,' here signifies Jerusalem itself, in which it was commonly used in the figurative language of the Prophet, and no doubt well understood by Ahaz: for we find the same word in many other passages used, either to signify a City, or the people of a City.

If, as declared by some writers, the Child promised in Isaiah, 7 c., 14 v., be the same as alluded to, in 9 c., 6 v., and 10 c., 17 v., it is quite evident from the context, that he was to be the deliverer of the Jews from the hands of the King of Assyria; and was to be distinguished by the excellence of his administration, and the respect in which he was to be held by all nations. Making allowance for the hyperbolical style of eastern nations, nothing can more apply as prophecy, than the passages do to the reign of Hezekiah, as described in *Kings* and *Chronicles*. But what, it may be asked, had the birth of Jesus the Christ, to do with the destruction of the King of Assyria? or how it could be said, that before he "knew to refuse the evil and choose the good," the land of Syria and Israel, should be deserted by their respective Kings, Rezin and Pekah—who were gathered to their Fathers, many hundred years before Christ was born?

This illustrious son of Ahaz was not the only King among the select nations of God, that was honoured with such names as Hezekiah, or, "God my strength," and Emmanuel, or, "God

"with us;" and also with such epithets, as "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, and Prince of Peace." We find several other chiefs of that tribe, that used to walk in the way of God, dignified in Scripture with names of a similar import: Genesis, 32 c., 28 v., "And he said thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel, (i. e., Prince of God), for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and has prevailed." Psalm 89, v. 18, "For the Lord is our defence, and the *Holy One* of Israel is our King;" 19 v., "Then thou spakest in vision to *My Holy One*, and saidst 'I have laid help upon one that is *Mighty*: I have exalted one chosen out of the people.'" 20 v., "I have found David my servant; with my holy-oil have I anointed him:" and 27 v., "I will make him *my first born*, higher than the kings of the earth." As to the word "a virgin," found in the English translation, on reference (as before observed) to the original Hebrew, as well as to the Greek of the Septuagint, you will judge whether a translation, which so entirely perverts the meaning throughout, by men whom we cannot suspect of ignorance of the original language, must not have proceeded from a previous determination to apply the term 'virgin' as found in the Prophet, to the mother of our Saviour, in order that the high titles applied to Hezekiah, might in the most unqualified manner be understood of Jesus.*

Many other observations could be advanced in support of the hypothesis, that the prophecy exclusively applied to Hezekiah; but from the foregoing remarks it will surely appear, even to those most prejudiced in favour of the popular doctrine, that such an interpretation is warranted by the language of Scripture.

Grotius and other learned commentators, finding that many of the prophecies supposed to relate to the Messiah, had an

* Mr. Moore, (Canon of St. Paul's) conjectures that the Hebrew word *the virgin*, in Isaiah, signified a virgin recently espoused to Abaz. "This is extremely probable," say the Editors of the British Critic, "and further enquiry may perhaps prove that such was the customary appellation for one of the Royal women, taken to the rank of Queen or Spouse."

obvious reference to eminent individuals who existed long before the time of Jesus, and wishing, at the same time, to retain in its full force the argument in favour of Christianity deduced from the prophecies of the Old Testament, had recourse to the theory of a double sense. Lowth availed himself of the same ingenious contrivance in the notes to his translation of Isaiah ; and sanctioned by his authority and example, this double dealing with the Scriptures of eternal truth. Whiston, with characteristic ingenuousness, opposed this theory, and contended, that "the prophecies of the Old Testament, at all appertaining to the Messiah, particularly those which are quoted as testimonies and arguments in the New Testament, do properly and solely belong to the Messiah, and do not at all concern any other person." And Dr. Benson in his "Essay concerning the Unity of Sense,"—made it his professed object—"to shew that no text of Scripture has more than one single sense." In accomplishing this object, the last mentioned writer was eminently successful: and although I cannot (says a learned Theologian) always agree with him in the application of his own principles, to the correctness of those principles themselves, I cordially and unhesitatingly subscribe. "We justly condemn the answers of the Heathen Oracles," says Dr. Benson, "as riddles, dark, and obscure, vague, and indefinite, capable of being turned many ways, without certainly knowing which sense was intended, or in what way they were to be understood. But Divine prophecies should be intelligible, and have one determinate meaning; that it may be known when and how they are accomplished. We admire it as an excellence in Homer, and other celebrated writers of antiquity, that their meaning is expressed clearly; and may we not expect, when God speaks to men, that his meaning should be expressed in as clear and determinate a manner? In a word, if the Scriptures are not to be interpreted, like the best ancient authors, in their one true, and genuine meaning, the common people will be led to doubt whether or no the Scriptures have any meaning at all. They will be for ever at a loss what to believe, and what to

"practice, upon what to ground their comfort here, and their "hope of salvation hereafter." The question then is—to whom did this prophecy apply? In answer thereto, many eminently learned men would say, that it solely and exclusively applied to Hezekiah.

You have stated, that "The actual transgression of man is "obnoxious to *Divine wrath*, and nothing short of Divine interposition in man's behalf, could possibly save men from "eternal death. Sin is of an *infinite* nature, because committed "against an *Infinite* Creator, and to render the attribute of "Divine justice consonant to Divine perfections, man, who is a finite being, was incapable of paying the demand to justice for "transgression,—this satisfaction was made by one who was "*Infinite*." According, therefore, to your interpretation, it was *not* the man Jesus who died upon the Cross, but *God himself*. This interpretation must assuredly be totally at variance with the true intent and meaning of the Scriptures—for the supposition that the God of Nature—the Almighty Creator of the Universe, should die on a Cross,—a voluntary sacrifice for the purpose of appeasing his *own wrath*,—or in other words, to make *satisfaction to himself*—is a proposition of such a monstrous character, that it surely cannot for a moment be seriously entertained by any man, who takes a rational and consistent view of the Sacred writings.

As many remarks have been made on the *cold and heartless* system of Unitarian Christianity, I will conclude, by quoting the following extract from a Sermon, lately published; the object of which, was to vindicate the simple doctrines of the Gospel. "Our particular views"—says the Author—"have "been commonly denounced by our Trinitarian brethren as "being wholly defective in moral value, because they make us "acquainted with no atonement for the supposed original and "infinite guilt of fallen nature, without which atonement, it is "said, we can have no sure hope of the mercy and favour of "God. But this is plainly nothing less than to raise an objection to our views upon a gratuitous assumption of the truth of

" their own ; for unless the most untenable and gloomy doctrines
 " of orthodoxy be first admitted as true, such an atonement was
 " never needed by man, nor could have been accepted by God.
 " It is little better than sophistry, therefore, to charge our repre-
 " sentation of Christianity with being defective, because it
 " contains no remedy for an evil which, if this representation be
 " correct, never existed. The truth, we humbly presume, is,
 " that our brethren, by their misinterpretation of the Sacred
 " writings, first plunge the whole human race, into an imaginary
 " abyss of guilt and woe ; and next, by further misinterpretation,
 " discover an imaginary method of delivering some few out of
 " this abyss, which they call upon us to admire as a peculiar
 " excellence of their system. They first, by their own vain
 " imaginings, cast over the whole face of human existence a
 " thick darkness which shuts out every ray of hope from the
 " bosom of man, and then reproach us that we have no doctrine
 " purposely revealed to dispel the withering gloom which they
 " themselves have created. But for every moral and spiritual
 " want, with which man really becomes acquainted from nature
 " or from revelation, assuredly Unitarian Christianity affords an
 " abundant supply. To the penitent sinner it points out a sure
 " way by which he may attain to the forgiveness and favour of
 " God, and this in a path expressly consecrated for the purpose,
 " by the mercy of Heaven, even in the broad way of repentance
 " and reformation. To them that be slow in the practice of vir-
 " tue and piety, it brings all the pleasing and all the awful
 " motives to righteousness, arising from the great themes of
 " future judgment, eternity, and the divine favour. To the
 " mourning children of affliction, it affords an inexhaustible
 " fountain of consolation and peace, by giving them faith in the
 " constant providence of a Heavenly Father, whose dispensations
 " are all mercy and truth. To them whose eyes are closing in
 " the darkness of death, it reveals the light of life and immor-
 " tality. And if men have been brought to suppose, that they
 " need anything of religion further than this, they are misled by

"false views of their own condition, or of the character and
"government of God."

Finally,—let us at all times endeavour to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God ; and then, whatever may be our faith in certain creeds, articles, and confessions of faith and doctrine, drawn up by fallible men, we may entertain a well grounded hope, that we shall at last, through the mediation of our Saviour, and the mercy and goodness of God, be partakers of the kingdom of Heaven.

I am, &c.

31st August, 1824.

'DENSYLI.'

The preceding Letter, the Editor of the Kent Magazine did not publish in his Miscellany, which 'Densyli' attributed to his disinclination to give further publicity to any additional remarks in defence of the Unitarian doctrine. "Audi alteram partem," is a principle on which, every person possessed of a liberal mind will always act. Surely, therefore, when we publish remarks which have for their object, the vilification and misrepresentation of the religious opinions of those who are opposed to us, in our interpretation of the Sacred writings, it is but equitable and just, to give the party whom we attack, every opportunity of vindication, so that the public may be enabled to come to an impartial judgment thereon.

'Densyli' would never have addressed the Editor of the Kent Magazine, had not the first number of his work, contained the following illiberal, unjust, and reproachful remark—"There are some Infidels among us, who to avoid the odious name of "Atheists, would shelter and screen themselves under the new "name of Deists or Unitarians." But in order further to evince the want of truth in this observation, let us contrast the belief of Deists, with that of Unitarian Christians.

Deists renounce the Christian Revelation altogether ; Unitarians receive the Gospel as a revelation from God the Father, by his only Son our Lord, Jesus the Christ. Deists believe Jesus to have been a cheat and impostor ; Unitarians believe him as

the inspired messenger of God, the Messiah, and Saviour of mankind. It may be justly asked, then, what more can be needed than these plain simple facts, to shew that Unitarians *do* hold other belief, than what is professed by Deists and Infidels? Further, Unitarians believe in the miracles of Christ, his Death, Resurrection, and Ascension; they believe in him as the Mediator and Redeemer, and through faith in him, and repentance unto newness of life, they humbly look to the promise of salvation. After this statement, it must surely be admitted by every reasonable man, that there is a wide distinction, between Deists and Unitarian Christians.

The Trinitarian and the Unitarian equally acknowledge the Divinity of Christ's mission, or, that he was the Messiah predicted by the ancient prophets; and the chief point of dispute is, whether the Messiah be a man highly inspired, or one of the angelic order, or as a being possessed of the attributes of Deity. *Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.* This was the advice of St. Paul to the primitive Christians, and no substantial reason has been, or ever will be, given for its being abandoned. Therefore none should be upbraided, because they differ with us in opinion. For a Protestant, who demands, and exercises the right of private judgment, to deny it to his brother, is an unpardonable inconsistency. It is also an act of injustice, and, therefore, contrary to reason, condemned by revelation, and prejudicial to the best interests of mankind. "No way whatsoever," says the immortal Locke, "that I shall walk in against the dictates of my conscience, will ever bring me to the mansions of the blessed. I may grow rich by an art I take no delight in. I may be cured of some disease by remedies I have no faith in; but I cannot be saved by a religion that I distrust, and a worship that I reject. It is in vain for an unbeliever to take up the outward shadow of another man's profession; faith only and inward sincerity are the things that procure acceptance with God."

In defence, therefore, of our own interpretation of the Sacred writings, we ought invariably to abstain from heaping obloquy

and reproach on those, who cannot conscientiously accord with us. We certainly have an unquestionable right, by fair and legitimate argument, to defend the doctrines of our own church, and to question the correctness of the religious opinions of others; but we have no right to use harsh and reproachful language towards those, who cannot interpret the Sacred writings agreeably to our own hypothesis, such conduct being totally at variance with the mild and beneficent principles which every Christian should profess; for our Saviour said, "Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right."—And St. Paul—"Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." And when it is considered that "the best of interpretations were but the interpretations of men, and that the best of men were liable to err," surely we ought to evince charity and forbearance towards those, whose religious tenets we imagine, are founded in fallacy and error.

The Christian worshipper should worship in *Truth*; and nothing is true to the human mind, but what carries conviction to the understanding: another man's truth is error to *him* who does not see it as true. If any one is convinced that the doctrine of the Trinity is proclaimed in the Bible, let him teach and expound it to the utmost of his power; but let him claim no dominion over the faith of others; and, much less, assume the power of excommunicating and denying the name of Christian to any one, who receives Christ as his Lord and Master, and admits the Scriptures as the highest source of Divine instruction vouchsafed to man.

The Unitarian interpretation of the following passage, in the 28th chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel—"Go ye and teach all "nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the "Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—This passage having been quoted by the Editor of the Kent Magazine, as sufficient, to establish the doctrine of the Trinity, and consequently the divinity of the person of Christ.

A profession of belief in God is unquestionably common to all religions supposed to have been founded on the authority of the Old Testament ; but each is distinguished from the other by a public profession of faith in their respective founders, expressing such profession in a language that may clearly exhibit the inferior nature of those founders to the Divine Being, of whom they declare themselves the messengers. This system has been carried on from the first, and was no doubt intended to serve as a perpetual distinguishing mark of faith. The Jews claim that they have a revelation, rendering belief not in God alone, but in Moses also, incumbent on them. Exodus, 14 c., 31 v.—"The "people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his servant Moses." But the term "his servant Moses" in this passage, suffices to prove the subordination of Moses, though declared, equally with God, to be an object of their belief. In like manner Mahumudans, in the first acknowledgment of that system of religion, are directed to profess faith in God, and also in Mohumud his messenger. The term "his messenger" removes every doubt of Mohumud's identity or equality with God ; so the epithet "the Son," found in the passage, "Baptizing them "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, &c.," ought to be understood, and admitted by every one, as expressing the created nature of Christ, though the most exalted among all creatures. If baptism were administered to one embracing Christianity in the name of the Father and the Holy Ghost, he would thereby be no more enrolled as a Christian, than as a Jew, or a Mohumudan ; for both of them, in common with Christians, would readily submit to be baptized in the name of God, and his prevailing influence over the universe. But as Christianity requires

a peculiar faith in Jesus, as the promised Messiah, the gracious Saviour enjoins baptism in the name *of the Son* also, so as to distinguish his happy followers from the Jews and the rest of the people. A mere association of names in divine commandments, therefore, never can be considered as tending to prove identity or equality between the subjects of those names : such junction of names is found frequently in the Sacred writings, without establishing unity among the persons whom those names imply.

The association of the name of the Holy Spirit with that of the Father of the Universe in the rite of baptism, has been considered by Trinitarians as decisive of the hypothesis of the separate personality of the Spirit, and consequently of the doctrine of the Trinity.

2 Chron., 20 c., 20 v., "Jehoshaphat stood and said, hear me, O Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem ; believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established ; believe in his Prophets, so shall ye prosper," wherein the name of the Prophets of God is associated with that of the Deity himself in the profession of belief, which is considered by Christians of all denominations, more essential than an external symbol of Christianity. Again, in Jeremiah, 30 c., 9 v., "But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their King, whom I will raise up unto them" The Lord here joins his name with that of David in the act of religious service, which is in the strictest sense due to God alone. Would it not, therefore, be unscriptural to make an attempt to prove the Deity of the Prophets, or David, under the plea that their names are associated with that of God in religious observances ? But we must do so, were we to follow the reasoning generally adopted.

God is invariably, in Revelation, represented as the main object of belief, receiving worship and prayers that proceed from the heart, through the first born of every creature, the Messiah : "No man cometh unto the Father but by me," John, 14 c., 16 v. ; and leading such as worship him in spirit to righteous conduct, and ultimately to salvation, through his guiding influence,

which is called the Holy Spirit : " When he the spirit of truth
 " is come, he will guide you unto all truth," John, 16 c., 13 v.
 There is, therefore, a moral obligation on those who avow the
 truth of such revelation to profess their belief in God, as the sole
 object of worship ; and in the Son, through whom they, as
 Christians, should offer divine homage ; and also in the Holy
 influence of God, from which they should expect direction in
 the path of righteousness, as the consequence of their sincere
 prayer and supplication. For the same clear reason also, in pub-
 licly adopting this religion, it is proper for those who receive it,
 should be baptized in the name of the Father, who is the object
 of worship ; of his Son, who is the mediator ; and of that in-
 fluence by which spiritual blessings are conveyed to mankind ;
 designated in the Scriptures as the Comforter, Spirit of Truth,
 or Holy Spirit. As God is declared through his Holy Spirit to
 have led to righteousness such as sought heartily his will, so he
 is equally represented to have, through his *wrath*, afflicted rebels
 against his authority, and to have prospered through his infinite
mercy, those who manifested obedience towards him ; as appears
 from the following passages : 2 Kings, 24 c., 20 v., " For
 " through the *anger* of the Lord it came to pass in Jerusalem,
 " until he had cast them out from his presence." Psalm 90, v:
 7, " For we are consumed by thy *anger*, and by thy *wrath* are
 " we troubled." Psalm 21, " And through the *mercy* of the
 " Most High he shall not be moved." Psalm 6, v. 4, " Return,
 " O Lord, deliver my soul : O save me for thy *mercy's* sake."
 Nor can we legitimately infer the idea of the self-existence, or
 distinct personality of the Holy Spirit, from such metaphorical
 language as the following : " The Holy Ghost is come upon
 " you," Acts, 1 c., 8 v. " The Holy Ghost shall teach you,"
 Luke, 12 c., 12 v. " The Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost,
 " whom the Father will send," John, 14 c., 26 v. For we find
 that expressions of a similar nature are applied to other attri-
 butes of God, personifying them equally with the Holy Spirit.
 Psalm 57, 3 v., " God shall send forth his *mercy* and his
 " *truth*." Psalm 85, v. 10, " *Mercy* and *truth* are met to-

"get'her." Psalm 100, v. 5, "The Lord is good, his *mercy* is everlasting." Psalm 33, v. 22, "Let thy *mercy*, O Lord, be upon us." Psalm 36, v. 5, "Thy *mercy*, O Lord, is in the heavens." Psalm 108, v. 4, "For thy *mercy* is great above the heavens." Ezekiel, 7 c., 3 v., "I will send my *anger* upon him." 2 Chron., 24 c., 18 v., "*Wrath* came upon Judah for this trespass."

If by the term "Holy Ghost" be meant a third distinct person of the Godhead, equal in power and glory with the Father of all, what do Trinitarians understand by such expressions as the following? viz.:—Matthew, 3 c., 11 v., and Luke, 3 c., 16 v. "He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with Fire." Acts, 10 c., 38 v., "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." Matthew, 12 c., 28 v., "I cast out devils by the Spirit of God." v. 21, "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." Luke, 4 c., 1 v. If the term "Holy Ghost," be synonymous with the third person of the Godhead, and "Christ" with the second person, the foregoing passages may be read as follows:—
 "He, the second person, shall baptize you with the third person of the Godhead and with fire." "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth (the second person of the Godhead) with the third person of the Godhead and with power." "I (the second person of the Godhead) cast out devils by the third person of the Godhead." "All manner of sin and blasphemy even against the first and second persons of the Godhead, shall be forgiven unto men; but blasphemy against the third person of the Godhead shall not be forgiven unto men." "Jesus (the second person of the Godhead) being full of the third person of the Godhead, returned from Jordan." But little reflection is necessary to enable any one to perceive the inconsistency of such paraphrases as the foregoing, and the reasonableness of adopting the usual mode of Scriptural interpretation of the original texts, according to which the foregoing passages may be understood as follows:—"He shall baptize you with the spirit

"of truth and purity." "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with his holy influence and power." "I cast out devils by the influence of God." "All manner of sin and blasphemy, even against the Christ, the first-born of every creature, shall be forgiven to men; but blasphemy against the power of God, shall not be forgiven unto men." "Jesus being full of the influence of God, returned from Jordan." Still more dangerous to true religion would it be to interpret, according to the Trinitarian mode, the passages which describe the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus on the occasion of his baptism. Luke, 3 c., 22 v., "And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a Dove upon him." For if we believe the Spirit in the form of a Dove, or in any other *bodily shape*, was really the third person of the Godhead, how can we justly charge with absurdity the Hindoo legends of the Divinity having the form of a fish or any other animal?

It ought to be remarked with respect to the text above quoted, denouncing eternal wrath upon those who blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, that the occasion on which the term was made use of by Christ, was the accusation of the Jews, that his miracles were the effects of an influence of a nature directly opposite to that of God, namely the power of Beelzebub, the prince of devils. The Jews alleged that he was possessed of an unclean or diabolical spirit. "Because, they said, he hath an unclean spirit." Mark, 3 c., 30 v. "They said, this fellow doth not cast out devils, but by the power of Beelzebub, the prince of devils." Matthew, 12 c., 24 v. Jesus affirms, that the spirit which enabled him to do those wonderful works was a holy spirit; and that whatever language they may hold with respect to himself, blasphemy against that power by which he did those miracles would not be forgiven. "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, shall not be forgiven unto men. And, whosoever speaketh against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be

"forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come." Matthew, 12 c., 31—32 v.

Were the words "all manner of blasphemy" in the passage in question, received as including blasphemy against the Father, the term must be thus understood: "All manner of blasphemy against the Father shall be forgiven; but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost must not be forgiven;" and consequently the interpretation would amount to an admission of the superiority of the Holy Ghost to the Father. In the above quoted passage, therefore, the exception of the Holy Ghost, must exclude blasphemy against the Father, and the whole should thus be interpreted:—All manner of blasphemy against men and angels, even against the first-born of every creature, shall be forgiven; but blasphemy against the power of God, by which Jesus declared himself to have cast out devils, shall not be forgiven. For further illustration, the whole passage is here quoted. Matthew, 12 c., 24—37 v.—"But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, 'this fellow does not cast out devils but by Beelzebub the prince of devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city and house divided against itself shall not stand. And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, except they bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad. Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the

“ world to come. Either make the tree good, and his fruit
 “ good ; or else make the tree corrupt : for the tree is known by
 “ its fruit. O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil,
 “ speak good things ? for out of the abundance of the heart the
 “ mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the
 “ heart, bringeth forth good things : and an evil man out of the
 “ evil treasure, bringeth forth evil things. But I say unto you,
 “ that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give ac-
 “ count thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words
 “ thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be con-
 “ demned.” Mark, 3 c., 29—30 verses : “ But he that shall
 “ blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but
 “ is in danger of eternal damnation : because they said, He
 “ hath an unclean spirit.”

Is it not evident from the above authority of Jesus himself,
 that the term “ Holy Ghost ” is synonymous to the prevailing
 influence of God ? and had not the power by which Jesus per-
 formed his miracles the same origin, and was it not of the same
 nature as that by which the children of Israel performed theirs ?
 “ If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children
 “ cast them out ? therefore they shall be your judges.” It may
 not be without use to notice here, that frequent instances are re-
 lated in the Scriptures of the influence of the Spirit of God, in
 leading righteous men to truth, before Jesus had commenced the
 performance of his divine commission ; in the same manner as
 it operated afterwards in guiding his true followers to the way of
 God, subsequent to his ascent to Heaven, in consequence of his
 repeated intercession with the Father. This will fully appear
 from the following passages :—Mark, 12 c., 36 v., “ David him-
 “ self said by the Holy Ghost, the Lord said to my Lord, sit
 “ thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy foot-
 “ stool.” The Evangelist Matthew employed a similar expres-
 sion, c 22, v. 43, “ How then doth David in the spirit call him
 “ Lord ? ” Luke, 4 c., 1 v., “ And Jesus, being full of the Holy
 “ Ghost, returned from Jordan, and was led by the Holy Spirit
 “ into the wilderness.” It must not, therefore, be supposed, that

the manifestation of this holy attribute of God, is peculiar to the Christian dispensation. We find in the Scriptures the term "God" applied figuratively in a finite sense to Christ, and to some other superiors, as has already been noticed : a circumstance which possibly may have tended to confirm such as are rendered from their early impressions partial to the doctrine of the Trinity, in the prepossessed notions of the Deity of Jesus. But with respect to the Holy Ghost, there, surely, does not appear a single passage in the whole Scriptures, in which the Spirit is addressed as God, or as a person of God, so as to afford the believers of the Trinity an excuse for their profession of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost. The only authority they quote to this effect, are as follows : Acts, 5 c., 3—4 v., " Peter said, Ananias, " why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost." " Thou has not lied unto men, but unto God." From which it is concluded, he that lieth to the Holy Ghost, lieth to God. John, 15 c., 26 v., " But when the Comforter is come, whom I " will send unto you from the Father, he shall testify of me." As to the first of these texts, it is to be remarked, that any sin or blasphemy against one of the attributes of God, is of course reckoned a sin or blasphemy against God himself. But this admission amounts neither to a recognition of the attribute, nor of its identity with God. With respect to the mission of the Spirit of Truth as a proof of its being a separate existence, and not merely an expression for the influence of God, the passage in question if so taken will run thus :—" But when God is come " whom I (God) will send unto you from God, even God who " proceedeth from God." Can there be an idea more polytheistical than what flows from these words? Yet those who maintain this interpretation express their detestation of polytheism. If with the view to soften the reasonableness of this interpretation, they think themselves justified in having recourse to the term "mystery," they cannot without injustice accuse Hindoos, the believers of numerous Gods under one Godhead, of absurdity, when they plead mystery in defence of their poly-

theism ; for under the plea of mystery, every appearance of unreasonableness may be easily removed.

It is surely, therefore, evident, from the foregoing remarks, that the text in St. Matthew's Gospel—"Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," cannot be applicable to the doctrine of the Trinity ; and from the idiom of Scripture language, it can admit of no other determination than the following, viz.,—Baptize in the name of the Father, as a profession of belief in God, as the sole object of worship : in the name of the Son, as expressive of a peculiar faith in Jesus the Christ, through whom they, as Christians, should offer divine homage : and in the name of the Holy Ghost, or Holy Influence of God, from which they should expect direction in the path of righteousness, as a consequence of their sincere prayer and supplication ; and by which spiritual blessings are conveyed to mankind, designated in the Scriptures, as the Comforter, Spirit of Truth, or Holy Spirit.

"He who goes about to speak of the mystery of the Trinity," says a late ancient and orthodox divine, "and does it by words "and names of human invention, talking of essences and existencies, hypostases and personalities, priorities and equalities, "and unity in pluralities, may amuse himself, and build a "Tabernacle in his head, and talk something he knows not what ; "but the good man, *that feels the power of the Father*, and to "whom the Son is become *wisdom*, and *sanctification* and *redemption*, in whose heart the love of the *Spirit of God* is shed "abroad—this man, though he understand nothing of what is "unintelligible, yet he alone truly *understands the Christian doctrine of the Trinity.*"

The doctrine of a Trinity in Unity is the strangest system of theology that ever entered into the minds of men, professing a belief in the Christian Revelation, it being evidently opposed to our Saviour's declaration, when he said—*Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets : I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.* But the Law and the Prophets taught

nothing that bore the least resemblance to the doctrine of the Trinity ; on the contrary, clearly and distinctly taught the faith and worship of the one living and true God ; and this, Jesus himself exemplified, when he said—*After this manner, therefore, pray ye : Our Father which art in heaven.* To say that three persons are one God and one God is three persons, is the highest pitch of inconsistency, and nothing more manifestly contradictory can be imagined. It confounds and disarranges all our ideas, and destroys all the principles of sound and just reasoning. The man who can calmly admit this doctrine, must for ever part with reason in religion, and has no criterion left him for distinguishing truth from error. He, who believes it, has no pretence for rejecting even the doctrine of transubstantiation itself. It is so palpably inconsistent with the nature of things, that some who have held and contended for the doctrine itself, could not bear to see it drawn out, and fully expressed in words. “ The word Trinity (says Luther) sounds oddly, and is of “ human invention ; it were better to call Almighty God—God “ —than Trinity ;” and Calvin observes in like manner, “ I “ like not this prayer, O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity ! It “ savours of barbarity : the word Trinity is barbarous, insipid, “ profane, a human invention, grounded on no testimony of “ God’s word, a popish God, unknown to the Prophets and “ Apostles.” All the real believers of the triple Godhead, (for the nominal and modal Tritarians are only disguised Unitarians), are guilty of a plain breach of the first sacred commandment of God to man, “ Thou shall have no other God but me.” They dishonour the one God and Father of all, by giving away his peculiar glory to another, and associating and comprehending other beings in the Godhead with him, who alone is the only Sovereign Lord of the Universe. They do this, no doubt, ignorantly, from the prejudice of education, and a mistaken apprehension of the Scriptures. Whoever acknowledges more Gods than one is an idolator, according to the Scriptural definition of the word ; and no pretended unity of essence, or of nature, can ever make three distinct divine agents to be one God. Divines

may amuse themselves, and deceive others, with scholastic jargon, arbitrary and unmeaning distinctions, and terms of human invention; they may cry out mystery, ineffable mystery, but the nature of things will not be altered or changed. A God the Father—a God the Son—and a God the Holy Ghost, distinguished by their personal properties, and possessing each of them all the proper attributes of divine nature, will still be three Gods, after all the unavailing attempts to prove them one God. As the doctrine of three divine persons, or intelligent agents, infers a breach of the first commandment, so, in like manner, the incarnation of God, or the supposed unions of the divine and human natures in Jesus the Christ, which the Trinitarians also maintain, necessarily implies a violation of the second precept of the decalogue. That precept strictly prohibits the worshipping of the one true God, under any bodily form or appearance whatever; and consequently those who acknowledge and adore Jesus the Christ, as God, do manifestly transgress this command. “For,” as an able writer observes, “when the Protestants invoke the one Almighty God of heaven and earth, by his nativity and circumcision, by his agony and bloody sweat, his cross and passion, his death and burial, they represent to us the bodily form of their Deity, as plain as if they placed a crucifix before our eyes. And accordingly they are not the churches and books of devotion of Roman Catholics only, in which images and pictures are to be found of the human Deity, or God-man, as the orthodox affect to to call him, whom both Papists and Protestants adore as the only true God.” It is evident, then, that the Trinitarian faith and worship is a species of idolatry in two respects; and it is truly surprising that rational creatures can continue in the belief and profession of a system, so contrary to the word of God, and the nature of things. An eminent philosopher, and one of the greatest geniuses that this kingdom ever produced (Lord Bacon) gave the following definition of Christianity, as it is exhibited, or rather disfigured, in certain creeds and articles: “A Christian is one that believes things his reason cannot comprehend. He believes three to

"be one, and one to be three ; a Father not to be older than his
 "Son ; a Son to be equal to his Father ; and one proceeding
 "from both, to be equal with both ; he believes three persons
 "in one nature, and two natures in one person ; he believes a
 "virgin to be the mother of a son, and that very son of hers to
 "be her maker ; he believes him to have been shut up in a
 "narrow room, whom heaven and earth could not contain ; he
 "believes him to have been ^{born} in time, who was, and is, from
 "everlasting. He believes him to have been a weak child
 "carried in arms, who is the Almighty ; and him once to have
 "died, who only hath life and immortality in himself."

The doctrine of the Trinity, if consistently adhered to and
 followed out, must have the worst effects with regard to practical
 religion, and tend to debase the nature of true, genuine piety.
 When men once come to believe, that there are more divine per-
 sons than one, they very naturally ascribe different qualities and
 properties to them. Accordingly, the Trinitarian tells us, that
 God the Father supports the majesty of the Godhead, and there-
 fore they assign to him, a strict, inflexible justice, that lays him
 under the necessity of pardoning no sin, without an infinite
 satisfaction, in order to vindicate the honour of his broken law.
 God the Son, it seems, according to them, possesses no such
 inflexible justice, for he not only forgives sins without any atone-
 ment, but makes an infinite satisfaction to the Father himself.
 God the Holy Ghost neither satisfies, nor is satisfied, and, there-
 fore, must be supposed, as well as the Son, to forgive sin freely.
 There are many absurdities and inconsistencies attending this
 irrational scheme of divinity. It is obvious, that while God the
 Father is considered in this unamiable light, that the affections
 of his creatures must be transferred from him to the other two
 persons. The Holy Ghost will appear a more gracious and
 merciful being than the Father, because he requires no satisfac-
 tion ; and the Son will appear still more amiable than the Holy
 Ghost, because he not only forgives sins freely, but satisfies the
 Father's offended justice. Thus, the "God and Father of all"
 will be unjustly deprived of the love of his creatures, and the

noblest incentive to sincere contrition, repentance, and reformation, will be taken away. For who can love a being that appears cruel, rigorous, severe, and divested of all those qualities which mutually beget pious and devout affections? Again, the scheme of three co-equal divine persons render it impossible to "love the Lord our God with all the heart, soul, and mind," as he has strictly commanded us to do. We cannot centre our supreme love upon three different objects. The highest affections of the human mind are incapable of being divided. And we shall be led to esteem and regard some of these supposed divine persons more highly than others, in proportion as we conceive them to be more or less favorably disposed towards us. This system is, therefore, unfavorable to rational piety and true devotion, and must have a tendency to produce superstition and enthusiasm. It distracts and confounds the mind of the worshipper, by presenting three different objects before him, each of whom, possessing all divine perfections, is equally entitled to that utmost reverence and love, which can be only given to one.

These are some of the sad consequences resulting from this tritheistical scheme of religion, but they are not the only ones. The doctrine of the Trinity has had other baneful effects, by impeding the progress of Christianity in the world, and preventing the conversion of Deists, Jews, Mohummudans, and Pagans. It is true, we ought not to give up any essential part of our religion to please unbelievers of any denomination; nor is it allowable to shape the doctrines of Christianity according to the fancies and caprices of men. But this doctrine being no part of the faith once delivered to the Saints, but a corruption of it, it is truly melancholy to reflect how much the religion of Jesus has suffered on that account. The Deists in our own country, taking their notions of Christianity from the creeds, articles, and confessions of our national establishments, and not giving themselves the trouble to examine the New Testament with critical care and skill, have taken it for granted that this tenet is contained in that incomparable book, and have assigned it as one of the reasons for rejecting the Christian faith. The Jews, although

in the early periods of their history, remarkably prone to idolatry, and severely punished by the Divine Being on that account, have yet, ever since their return from the Babylonish captivity, preserved uncorrupted among themselves the faith and worship of the one living and true God, and are really a standing reproach, on this account, to Christians. The doctrine of the Trinity is one of their principal objections against Christianity. They look upon it with the utmost abhorrence, as an impious, idolatrous system, inculcating the belief of more divine persons than one, and raising the creature to the dignity of the Creator. Let a Trinitarian endeavour to convert a Jew to the belief of his own tenets, and he will tell him that the law of God, the revelation of the Almighty in the Old Testament, forbids it. He will tell him that he will never give up the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob,—the God of Moses and the Prophets, the one adorable Jehovah, the God of Israel, who was the God of his ancestors; for this new God, this triune deity, that Christians have devised. The creeds and public offices of devotion of the Jews are formed upon principles diametrically opposite to those of Trinitarians. One article of their creed is this: "I believe with an entire faith, that God the Creator is one person, and that the unity or oneness of which is in him, is not in any other." And a hymn which is in daily use among them, contains the following words: "And God shall be King over all the earth: in that day there shall be one God, and his name one." Zach., 14 c., 9 v. In like manner as it is written in thy law, "Hear, O Israel, God our God, is one God." This, (says the author from which this quotation is taken) is so drawn up by them, in opposition to the belief of Christians, as though we adored more Gods than one, or gave him more names than one, viz., that of Christ.

The Mahommedans have also expressed the strongest aversion to the doctrine of the Trinity, and have severely reproached Christians for their adherence to it. The general prevalence of that doctrine gave Mahomet the greatest advantage in propagating and establishing his new religion. This impostor

arrogated to himself the title of the prophet and messenger of God, and sent to reclaim mankind from idolatry, and restore the true worship of the Divine Being. He borrowed his just notions of the divine unity from the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which he owned to be the true revelations from God, but blamed Christians for departing from them. He had either the sagacity or good fortune to discover in the Bible what many Christian divines have not found, or affected not to find there. Amidst all the rubbish and extravagance with which the Koran abounds, the Divine Unity is a truth, which shines there with distinguished lustre; and, in the opinion of some, contributed not a little to forward the rapid progress made by Mohummudanism in the world. The Mohummudans particularly value themselves upon this one article of their creed, and style themselves Moslems, or believers, on account of it. Christians they make no scruple to call, Infidels and Idolators; nor is there the smallest hope, that they ever will renounce their attachment to their pretended prophet, until Christianity is exhibited to them, under a very different form from that which prevails in most Christian countries, and the belief of the one only God, or Divine person, is fairly and unequivocally acknowledged. Nor can the conversion even of Pagans be expected, while the doctrine continues to be held and taught by Christians. Every argument by which we would attempt to convince them of their absurdity of a multiplicity of Gods, will be found to militate equally strong against the Trinity of Divine persons. "One may read" (says Emlyn) "in Le Compt's history of China, how the heathens derided the Christian doctrine of a mortal God; and upon that account esteemed Christianity as fabulous as their own religion." And Dr. Causaban, in his book of Credulity and Incredulity, says, "he could prove by many instances out of history, that this doctrine has kept more people from embracing the Christian faith, than any other thing he knew of." One memorable instance of the truth of this assertion, out of many others, is the following.

About the beginning of the last century, the King of Denmark

sent some Lutheran divines as missionaries to the province of Malabar, in the East Indies, in order to convert the inhabitants of that country from idolatry to the belief of Christianity. These missionaries had many conferences with the natives on various theological topics, and were at great pains to show them the absurdity of their own religion, and induce them to change it. The following quotation is part of a conference betwixt a Malabar physician of Nagapatam, and one of the missionaries.—

Missionary: God does not appear in a bodily shape, said I, for he is a Spirit; but he has appeared and revealed himself by his Son Jesus Christ, who clothed himself with the garments of mortality, to the end that he might suffer for our sins, reconcile us to God, and bring us to him, and do his will, which is our salvation. If you believe in Christ, the Redeemer of mankind, your mind will be more and more enlightened in the knowledge of the Supreme Being. Who is his Son? said he (the physician). And is he also God? I answered, he is God blessed for ever." But pray, Sir, recollect yourself, said he: have you not just now been inveighing against a plurality of Gods? and now I find you have yourself more than one: the Father is God, and the Son is God; then you have two Gods. I answered,—we do not believe in two Gods, but only in one God; though at the same time we firmly believe that there are three persons in one divine essence, and yet these three persons are not three, but one God: and this we believe as a great mystery, transcending our weak, finite faculties. We are satisfied it is a revealed truth in Scripture; and God, who knows himself, has enjoined us to believe a Trinity of persons in one divine essence; which we call Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If God has a son, said he, then your God, as well as some of ours, must have a wife, and is, by consequence, a material being. God is a Spirit, said I, and therefore has no bodily shape, and consequently could not have a son in the ordinary way of generation; but, without any knowledge of a consort, he begat his son from eternity, by generation not to be paralleled by time; and from Father and Son, proceeds the Holy Spirit, the third person in

the blessed Trinity, which, though to us mortals, incomprehensible, yet the probability thereof may be shadowed forth by an easy, familiar comparison. Out of the immaterial soul of man, proceeds, and is born the understanding, and from the essence of the soul and understanding emanates or proceeds the will, and yet the soul, (as to its essence), the understanding, and the will, are really but *one*, and the same thing. The application thereof is easy to the doctrine of the Trinity, as far as divine things may be compared to things created, that are within our ken. I find, said he, that you with subtle ways of arguing can make a Trinity consistent with unity; and if your explication is absolutely necessary to make others understand what you mean, pray allow us the same advantage of explaining the doctrine of our religion, and putting it in the most favorable light we can for the excluding of the absurdities imputed to us. And this once granted us, it will follow that *our plurality* does not destroy the *unity* of God, no more than *your Trinity* does. We worship the Gods upon no other account than because they are vicegerents of the Almighty, whose administration he employs in governing the world, as he did employ them at the beginning in creating and forming the same. And our God appearing among men at sundry times under different shapes, had at every apparition a different name given him, which contributed very much to the multiplicity of our images; whereas, in truth, they are but different representations of the same God, under different aspects and appearances.*

This passage is too plain to need any comment; and it is evident from it, that Pagans may, and do justify themselves in the faith and worship of any number of Gods whatever, by the same arguments that a Trinity of divine persons is defended. They can easily invent comparisons and fallacious modes of reasoning, and may with the same propriety make a specific Diety out of their numerous Gods or divine persons, as the

* Thirty-four Conferences between the Danish missionaries and the Malabarian Bramins, translated from the High Dutch, by Mr. Phillips, London, 1719.

Trinitarians do out of three; or may have recourse to other metaphysical subtleties, and talk of personalities, subsistences, modes, and relative properties; and thus any system of idolatry may be contended for, upon the same principles by which a Trinity of divers persons is maintained. The Papists believe in Transubstantiation, by comparing it with the doctrine of the Trinity; and when the absurdity of the former opinion is charged upon them by Protestants, declare that the one is not less consonant to reason than the other. And it is no difficult matter to trace the rise of the whole system of Popery from this one article alone. When men once went the length to exalt Jesus the Christ, to a proper equality with God Almighty, they were naturally led to pay religious honours and worship to his mother Mary in the next place, and from thence proceeded the invocation of Saints and Angels, and the adoration of the Host after its consecration.

These are the dismal effects that have followed from a departure from the faith and worship of the Father, the one only living and true God, and it is only by the restoration of this capital and original article of the Jewish and Christian Revelations, that the downfall of the errors, both of the Romish and Protestant systems of theology may be expected, and the general reception of Christianity in the world at large can be secured. May the Divine Being bring it speedily about, that the Gospel may become a common blessing to all the nations of the earth, and have that proper influence on the minds and actions of men, which its genuine and uncorrupted doctrines are so well calculated to produce! The Unitarian system has of late years made a considerable progress in various parts of this United Kingdom, and has now many able and zealous advocates who openly profess it, and employ their learning and talents in its defence. From the continued exertions and repeated efforts of these excellent persons, it is to be expected that this great and good cause will prevail more and more, and that the prejudices of those who oppose the truth, will be gradually mitigated, and at last effectually removed. Some of the advocates of Unitarianism have given the most unequivocal proofs of sincerity by

resigning Church preferments, and submitting to great temporal inconveniencies, because they could no longer conscientiously uphold and support a system of theology, which they believed to be nothing more, than the relic of a dark and barbarous age.

A list of Clergymen of the Established Church of England and Ireland, whose conscientious and careful study of the Sacred Oracles conducted them to Unitarianism. Many of them, it should be added, in consequence thereof, voluntarily sacrificed their prospects of preferments, and others resigned their benefices.

Rev. Daniel Whirby, D.D., Chanter of the Church of Sarum.

Rev. William Whiston, M.A., sometime Professor of Mathematics in the University of Cambridge.

Rev. Samuel Clarke, D.D., Rector of St. James's, Westminster.

Right Rev. Benjamin Hoadley, D.D., Bishop of Winchester.

Right Rev. Robert Clayton, D.D., Bishop of Clogher.

Rev. W. Hopkins, Vicar of Bolney.

Rev. Henry Taylor, Vicar of Portsmouth—Author of "The Apology of Benjamin Ben Mordicai, &c."

Rev. William Robertson, D.D., Rector of Ravilly, in Ireland.

Right Rev. Edmund Law, D.D., Bishop of Carlisle.

Rev. Edward Evanson, Vicar of Tewkesbury.

Rev. Theodore Lindsay, M.A., Vicar of Catterick.

Rev. John Jebb, M.D., F.R.S., Rector of Homersfield.

Rev. William Manning, Rector of Diss, Norfolk.

Rev. William Chambers, D.D., Rector of Achurch in Northamptonshire.

Rev. John Disney, D.D., Vicar of Swinderby.

Rev. Robert Tyrwhitt, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, and Founder of the Hebrew Scholarships, Cambridge.

Rev. John Jackson, B.A., refused M.A. by the University on account of his Anti-Trinitarianism.

- Rev. Arthur Sykes, D.D., Rector of Panton.
 Rev. John Jortin, D.D., Rector of St. Dunstan's in the East.
 Rev. Henry Maty, of the British Museum.
 Rev. Gilbert Wakefield, Fellow of Jesus College.
 Rev. William Friend, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College, and Vicar of Long Stanton.
 Rev. Richard Elliott, B.A. of Bennett College.
 Rev. — Vickers, Ireland, Author of "Basanistes."
 Most Rev. William Newcome, D.D., Archbishop of Armagh.
 Rev. Francis Stone, Rector of Cold-Norton, Essex.
 Rev. E. Harries, Cambridge.
 Rev. Thomas Fishe Palmer, Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge.
 Rev. Thomas Brown, Fellow and Tutor of Peter House.
 Rev. James Lambert, Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
 Rev. Robert Garnham, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College.
 Rev. Stephen Browne, Pembroke College, Cambridge.
 Rev. John Hammond, Fellow of Queen's College.
 Rev. Christopher Wyvill, LL.B., Queen's College.
 Rev. S. Fripp, Queen's College.
 Right Rev. John Law, D.D., Bishop of Elphin.
 Rev. George Armstrong.

Lay members of the same Church, who are known to have come to the same conclusion.

- Lord Falkland, the friend of Chillingworth.
 John Milton, M.A., Christ Church.—See his Treatise on Christian Doctrine.
 Sir Isaac Newton, M.A., Trinity College.
 John Locke, Christ Church, Oxford—Author of the "Essay on the Human Understanding."
 William Penn, Christ Church, Oxford.
 Sir Joseph Ichyll, Master of the Rolls.
 Lord Chancellor King.
 John, first Viscount Barrington.

Abraham Tucker—Author of "The Light of Nature pursued."
The Duke of Grafton, M.A., Chancellor of the University of Cambridge.

Sir William Jones, M.A., University College, Oxford.

Capel Loft, Peter House.

Richard Porson, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge.

George Dyer, M.A., Emanuel College, Cambridge.

Baron Maseres, Cursitor Baron of the Exchequer.

Serjeant Heywood, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.

James Losh, M.A., Recorder of Newcastle.

F. B. Barton, B.A., Peter House.

In addition to the above, may be added the names of the celebrated French Minister, M. Guizot, one of the most enlightened, and respected men in Europe; and the late Dr. Channing, who was one of the most celebrated men in America, for learning and piety.

To the preceding list might probably be added many of the present generation, members of the Established Church, both lay and clerical; men of intelligent and liberal minds, who are not disposed to believe the Unitarian Doctrine is so unscriptural as some of their less informed and prejudiced brethren imagine it to be: but who, from a variety of causes, feel themselves compelled, still outwardly to profess a belief in that system of theology, in which they have been brought up. As mankind, however, become more enlightened, it is surely not unreasonable to conclude, that many dogmas which are now held sacred by the great body of Christians will be rejected; and that the worship of the one only true God, in conformity to the Gospel of Jesus the Christ, will be restored to its original purity and simplicity; and that the time will arrive, (as was said by the great Sir Isaac Newton) "When the doctrine of the Incarnation, as it is commonly understood, will be exploded as an absurdity, equal to Transubstantiation."

Remarks on the Nature of the Jewish Sacrifices, with Observations on the Doctrine of the Atonement.

The Sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise. Psal. 51.

If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us. But if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness 1 John.

Sacrifices were most certainly instituted by the Deity ; being, no doubt, a memorial of some covenant made with man, or as a means of renewing his communion with his Creator ; that this is their real design, will appear by referring to their original institution, which appears to have been immediately after Adam's transgression ; for, at this time the Promise was made, that "the seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent's head." Gen., 3 c, 15 v., the memorial of which was a Lamb slain. It is true, this is not positively stated, the history of the first ages being so summary, but it may certainly be inferred ; it also appears to be corroborated by a variety of texts both in the Old and New Testaments, of which, Rev., 12 c., 8 v., is a striking instance, as Jesus is there called "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," and is certainly referred to by the Baptist—"Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world." John, 1 c., 29 v. It also may be inferred, that they were to be continued; for Abel sacrificed a Lamb, an offering that appears to have been agreeable to Divine appointment, being denominated an act of faith, Heb., 10 c., 4 v., and likewise a righteous act, 1 John, 3 ; and having been practised as a religious act by all the Patriarchs, it is further confirmed, as well as by the Mosaic Institutions, particularly in the daily sacrifice, where a Lamb was also offered. And as every approach to the Deity must have been according to his own appointment, any other approach must have been highly improper; for on this account, it evidently appears that Cain's offering was rejected, while that of Abel's was accepted, for the acts of the brothers refer to their respective offerings, Abel's being denominated righteous, be-

cause in obedience to the Divine institution ; while Cain's is said to be wicked, because he made an offering of his own head, that is, one not sanctioned by the appointment of the Deity.

Thus then it appears, that sacrifices were symbols, or, memorials of a covenant entered into by the Deity, which will be confirmed by Gen., 15 c., 18 v., where God made a covenant with Abraham when he promised him the land of Canaan ; on which occasion, he also prescribes what offerings shall be made as a memorial thereof ; the same will also be fully confirmed, in the institution of the Passover, at which the blood of the Lamb sprinkled upon the door-posts and lintels of the houses of the Israelites, was made the seal of their safety, the memorial of a covenant to deliver them from the destroying Angel, while the first-born of the Egyptians were cut off ; yet, in neither of these instances, is there anything like a satisfaction for sin, or any kind of substitution in the sinner's stead ; nevertheless, it is a lively picture of the mercy and goodness of God.

Those, who may find much difficulty in admitting the foregoing statement, with respect to Sacrifices ; will, probably refer me to the offerings made by the High Priest on the day of Atonement, a term that would have been more intelligible, if called reconciliation ; for, in this sense, it is used in the chapter where it is recorded, which is Lev. 16, the particulars of which, demand the most serious attention, and are as follows. First, Aaron is directed to offer for himself and his house, a young Bullock for a sin-offering, and a Ram for a burnt-offering. Then for the congregation two Kids of the Goat for a sin-offering, and a Ram for a burnt-offering. Lots being cast for the Goats, one was to be slain, and the other was reserved to be let go in the wilderness. The blood of the Bullock was to be sprinkled with Aaron's finger upon the Mercy-seat, and before it ; the same was to be done with the blood of the Goat ; after this, the blood of both was to be put upon the horns of the altar, and sprinkled upon it, as was done with the mercy-seat, and then the holy-place was said to be reconciled : after this, Aaron was to lay his hands on the head of the live Goat, and confess the sins of the

congregation over him, which, being done, was then to be sent by a fit man into the wilderness, and thereby bear, or take away the sins. It is certainly true, that by these ceremonies there is an acknowledgment of sin and impurity, and the necessity of its removal pointed out before communion with the Deity could take place, which was effected only, by the means He Himself appointed. It is, however, worthy of remark, that the Holy-place, as well as Aaron and the Congregation, is considered as defiled, and requires to be reconciled and cleansed from all impurity, and when removed, every impediment to communion with the Deity appears to be taken away; and by the Goat's bearing away the sins of the congregation into a land not inhabited, a striking figure of the forgiveness of sins is presented to us, especially by the reconciliation of the Holy-place, of which the Mercy-seat forms the most essential part, as it was there, Jehovah was supposed to dwell, by the symbol of his presence, the cloud; the defilement thereof being removed by these rites, the High Priest, as the people's representative, was privileged to draw nigh to God.

Although it is admitted, that many references made to those ceremonies, and to the Passover, by the Psalmist, Isaiah, and the Apostles, are applied to Jesus, yet it requires a very fertile imagination to discover any sort of satisfaction for sin, or substitution in the sinner's stead therein: it must nevertheless be acknowledged, that in those offerings where the animals are slain, the demerit of sin is clearly pointed out, and that confession thereof, ought always to accompany our approaches to a Being of infinite perfection and purity, for upon that, pardon is promised; but it ought always to be recollected, that it is God's prerogative alone to pardon, to acquit, and justify sinners; that it is spontaneous and free, not bought or purchased by any payment, or price whatever; for, it is said, "There is forgiveness with Thee, that thou may be feared." Psalm 130.—And again, "To the Lord our God, belong mercies and forgivenesses." Dan., 9 c. Further also, to establish the truth, that sacrifices were intended as memorials of a covenant made, not expiatory, or to appease the

Divine wrath, the language of the Psalmist must be conclusive :
 " Gather my saints together unto me, those who have made a
 " covenant with me by sacrifice," Psalm 50, which is applicable
 either to God's covenant, or any other votive offering made by
 Israel.

That Sacrifices were to be continued only until the promised
 Messiah appeared, seems perfectly clear ; for soon after his cru-
 cifixion, they ceased altogether, the Jews being cut off from being
 a people, the City and Temple being taken and destroyed ;
 which calamity took place because they rejected the Messia^h, an
 event that probably happened nearly about the time of the esta-
 blishment of the Christian Church ; for, although the Promise
 may be said to be fulfilled upon the public appearance of the
 Messiah, and particularly when he died upon the Cross, saying
 it is finished ; as the grand purpose of his coming was to bless
 mankind by the establishment of a pure and spiritual religion
 among a people called by a new name, it may be said to be
 more fully accomplished, when the Christian Church was esta-
 blished.

It has been supposed that sacrifices were necessary to placate
 the Deity, satisfy his justice, and obtain forgiveness, and peculiar
 favours of him from his offending creatures. Such notions were
 common among the ancient heathens, and as the life of a man
 was deemed more valuable than the life of any other creature, to
 avert a great calamity, human victims were sometimes offered.
 The supposition that murder could be pleasing to the Deity,
 when committed as an act of religion, seems to have been the
 lowest degradation of reason, and the vilest branch of supersti-
 tion. Yet, this gross darkness of heathenism has been suffered
 to obscure the glorious light of the Gospel, by the adoption of
 the popular notion of the Atonement, which supposes that the
 wrath of God was appeased, and his justice satisfied for the sins
 of men, by the cruel murder of Jesus his beloved Son ! This
 notion of Sacrifices stands completely refuted by the revelation
 God hath afforded of himself in the Scriptures, *as a God of love,*
the Father of mercies, a Being delighting in mercy, who is ever

ready to forgive: and by the leading character of the Gospel, as a system of grace, or divine free favour, containing the free forgiveness of sins, and free salvation, on repentance, for guilty men.

The Jewish Sacrifices, and that of Christ, have been supposed to have been vicarious, but this notion is contrary both to reason and Scripture. That the righteous Governor of the Universe should punish the innocent in the place of the guilty, is repugnant to all his declarations, and abhorrent to every feeling of justice. That the Jewish Sacrifices were not vicarious is evident, for no sacrifice was appointed, or could be accepted, in any case where life was forfeited under the law, and only in such a case was a vicarious sacrifice possible: and no sacrifice was appointed for a breach of any one of the ten commandments:

Sacrifices have been too commonly regarded as a substitute for moral purity and personal righteousness. That the Jewish Sacrifices were intended for no such purpose is most evident; for when they were offered without regard to moral purity and personal righteousness, God declared his abhorrence of them. Isaiah, 1, 11—15. That the death of Christ was not designed to supply the place of personal righteousness is equally manifest; for he did not come to be the minister of sin: a higher degree of purity and moral righteousness is required of those who live under the Gospel, than was required of those who lived under the law, and the displeasure of God is still revealed from heaven, against all unrighteousness of men.

It has been taken for granted, that Sacrifices were originally offered for men as sinners, but the contrary is the fact; they were offered by the righteous, as Abel and Noah; and the acceptance of them was a token of God's approbation of the character of him who offered them; because God did not respect or approve of the person of Cain, he would not accept his offering. See Gen. 4, 5—7, and Heb. 11, 4.

The most ancient idea which the Scriptures convey of a Sacrifice is, that they were gifts or presents. Abel's offering is called his gift. It is natural to conjecture, that in the infancy

of the world, the pious man, from a sense of his dependence on the Almighty, and from a principle of gratitude and allegiance to him, would select some part of his substance, and present it as an offering expressive of his feelings, and that God would give some token of his accepting of the present of the good man. Such a proceeding would accord with the infantile ideas entertained by men in the earliest ages, and may best account for the origin of Sacrifices. Noah's Sacrifice appears to have been an expression of gratitude for the preservation of himself and family in the Ark. Many of the Jewish offerings were designed to express gratitude and allegiance to God, as their God and King. This view of the subject may be illustrated by what has been the custom in the East in all ages, of an inferior approaching a superior with a present to introduce him, and the acceptance of the present being regarded as a token of favour.

The next idea of Sacrifices we meet with in the Scriptures is, that they were used as a confirmation of a covenant. In this way God confirmed his word to Abraham. See Gen. 15. The covenant God made with Israel, was confirmed by their Sacrifices: the blood of the Sacrifice, was the blood of the covenant, and the repetition of the sacrifices was to bring the covenant and the obligations continually in view. See Heb. 9, 18, 19, 20.

These two ideas were conceived to comprehend the whole scriptural doctrine of literal sacrifices, so far as relates to their design. From the earliest times, it appears men were in the habit of confirming leagues and covenants by slaying a victim, dividing its parts, and mutually partaking of its flesh; as this was the manner of man, the Almighty might condescend to adopt it in compassion to human weakness, for the ratification of his declarations and covenant; as, after the manner of men, he interposed with an oath. Heb. 6, 16, 17. Because the death of Christ was the confirmation of the Gospel, as a covenant of Divine mercy, it is called a sacrifice, in allusion to the confirmation of the Jewish covenant, and his blood, the blood of the everlasting covenant. Sinners in every age are to draw near to God with the sacrifice of a contrite spirit, which he will not despise.

Christians are to offer to God, the sacrifice of praise continually, and of benevolent conduct ; and to devote themselves as a living sacrifice, by an undeviating course of piety and virtue Heb. 13, 15—16—Rom. 12, 1. Such are the figurative sacrifices, and none other, they are called on to offer.

“ As by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so “ by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous.”

This text from St. Paul gives not the slightest countenance, when properly understood, to the unscriptural doctrine, in support of which, many are perpetually quoting. Its interpretation is simply this :—As by following the fatal example of one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by that pattern of perfect obedience which Christ has set before us, shall many be made righteous. This passage, thus understood, is as true as it is intelligible, and is equally consistent with reason and scripture.

According to that Gospel which hath hitherto been the pillar of the Christian world, we are taught that whosoever endeavours to the best of his ability, to reform his manners, and amend his life, will find pardon and acceptance. “ When the wicked man “ turneth away from the wickedness he hath committed, and “ doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul “ alive.” And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of *repentance* for the remission of sins. “ I tell you, *except* ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.”

Does our Saviour teach in any one passage of his Gospel, that there was anything in his sufferings, that would alter the nature of sin ; and that his blood, shed by the most obstinate and cruel bigots that ever disgraced human character,—would, when thus shed, exempt sinners from the punishment denounced against their crimes ? Did he, in any one instance, affirm that the blood thus spilt, was in itself effectual to the pardon of guilt, and would therefore annul that solemn declaration of God, that he would in a future life render to every man according to his works ? Did he invite the miscreant multitude that flocked with frantic mockery to his cross—did he invite them to wash their guilt away, in the blood they were shedding ? Did our

Saviour after his resurrection, in any manner, or on any occasion, even allude to his blood, as cleansing the impure from their vices, or as clearing the guilt from their crimes? Did he, when risen from the dead, give commission to his Disciples to direct those, who had lived in open violation of his laws, *to a fountain filled with blood*? No—"I've said unto them, thus it is written, and thus it behoveth Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and *re-mission* of sins, should be preached in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Thus we see repentance held forth as the sole condition on which pardon, or the remission of sins can be obtained, and we have it left upon record as the *last*, as well as the *first* revealed will of God, that this solemn truth shall be preached to all nations.

The language of our Saviour is always intelligible—"Let him that hath stolen, steal no more." Such was his moral admonition, and none to whom it was addressed were perplexed about its meaning. When the young man enquired of him the way to eternal life, he did not direct him to the "blood of sprinkling," a phrase so perpetually perverted in the mouths of modern teachers—but he answered in language in which there was nothing vague or indefinite—"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." And when the youth pressed the inquiry more closely, our Saviour proceeds to lay before him distinctly, and one by one, those rules of *moral duty* to which it was indispensable he should conform. And he said unto him, which? "Jesus said, thou shalt do no murder, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not bear false witness, &c." Our Saviour here proposes no other mode of salvation than the practice of piety, and the cultivation of habits of moral goodness. So likewise when—"a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying,—what shall I do to inherit eternal life." He refers him to that *moral law*, which some hold in such utter contempt, as to its concern and salvation. "He said unto him—What is written in the law? How readest thou? And he answering

“said, thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and
 “with all thy soul, and with all thy strength; and thy neighbour
 “as thyself. And he said unto him, thou hast answered right,
 “*this do*, and thou shalt live.”

As the death of Christ has for its object, the salvation of all
who obey him, and as he “gave himself for us, that he might
 “redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people
 “zealous of *good works*”—having died for this purpose, he is
 truly and justly said to have died for our salvation; and it is
 with the figure of speech equally correct, that thus we are said to
 have redemption through his blood.

But that by *atonement* for their guilt, he becomes the author of
 salvation, to those who *disobey*, is *not* true.

That he came to redeem sinners from the punishment of all
 iniquity, by suffering in their stead—is *not* true.

That he gave himself for those who were not zealous of good
 works—is *not* true.

That when he shall come to judge the earth, he will impute his
 righteousness to the wicked—is *not* true.

That they will be benefitted by his death, who never bene-
 fitted by his life—that those whom the promises of the Gospel
 could never stimulate to holiness, will receive, through his blood,
 the reward promised only to the practice of virtue—is *not* true.

“What we have done in our bodies, whether it be good or
 evil”—so shall we be judged.

“Thou meetest him” (says the Prophet Isaiah) “that re-
 “joiceth and worketh righteousness.”

“Open ye the gates” (says the Prophet) “that the righteous
 “nation, which keepeth the truth, may enter in.”

The sufferings and death of Christ were necessary for the
 completion of the work, which the Father gave him to do, to
 condemn sin in the flesh, and complete the ministration of
 righteousness. He was to be an evidence to the world of the
 practicability of standing against sin. His whole ministry,
 spirit, and conduct, was a condemnation of sin, and he resisted
 to blood—striving against it. He preached righteousness in the

great congregation, he exemplified its purest principles in his whole temper and conduct, and by his obedience to death, he completed his ministry.

His obedience to death was necessary in order to his being rewarded with all power in heaven and earth, *i. e.*, to his commission being extended to the whole world, Gentiles as well as Jews; for he declared before, that he was only sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Had he not have performed his work, he would not have attained his reward. Without his submitting to death, his obedience had been incomplete: and had he not have completed it, he must have lost his reward: he would not have been exalted and glorified: he would not have been made both Lord and Christ, nor have been exalted as a Prince and Saviour; salvation would not have been preached in his name to the Gentiles, he would not have been appointed to raise the dead, and to judge the world.

Under these views, Christ's submitting to death appears to be necessary, in order to his attaining all future greatness, and to his becoming a universal blessing to mankind. This, therefore, gives the greatest importance to his death.

His death was necessary to complete his example. He can be an example to us only so far as he was like us in his nature, state, and circumstances, or as we are capable of becoming like him. Had he never suffered, he could not have been an example to us in suffering: had he never died, he could not have been an example to us in dying: had he not voluntarily have died a violent death for the sake of truth and righteousness, he could not have been an example to those who are called to submit to a violent death, rather than deviate from truth and rectitude. Had he not perfectly obeyed, he could not have been an example of perfect obedience. But now by his death his character is perfected, his qualifications are completed, his testimony is finished, his obedience is tried and found perfect, he receives a glorious reward, and we have a suitable and perfect example of every excellency attainable by us.

Christ died to introduce the Gospel to the Gentiles, to break

down the middle wall of separation between the Jews and them, and to confirm the Gospel as a covenant of mercy and grace to mankind. As his commission before his death extended only to the Jews, and his personal ministry related to them solely, he had not authority to send the Gospel to the Gentiles, till he rose from the dead, when, as a reward for his obedience to death, he received such additional authority, as extended his missions and ministrations to the whole world, on the ground of which he commissioned his Apostles, to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. Hence it is, that it is said, he hath broken down the middle wall of partition, reconciled Jews and Gentiles in one body, and to have made peace between them : namely, because, as the reward of his obedience to death, he has received a commission which embraces the whole world, and is appointed to minister all the blessings of grace and salvation to the whole human race. As covenants in ancient times were confirmed by blood, and God's covenant with Israel was confirmed by the blood of their sacrifices, so the Gospel which is spoken of as a covenant, because in it God hath promised his mercy and favour to the penitent and obedient, was confirmed by the death of Christ. Hence his blood, is called the blood of the New Testament, and the blood of the everlasting covenant. In reference to this it is called the blood of sprinkling, and is said to speak better things than *Abel* ; because under the law the covenant was confirmed by the sprinkling of blood, and whatever the covenant expresses, the blood which confirms it, is, by a figure of speech, said to express. Thus Jesus had a great object before him in submitting to death, an important design to carry into effect, to attain to the high honour of becoming a universal blessing to the world, by receiving as the reward of his obedience, a commission and authority to extend the Gospel to the Gentiles : and as he died to confirm its blessings to mankind, hence it is said, that for the joy that was set before him, he endured the cross, despised the shame, and is set down on the right hand of God. Heb. 12, 2.

In reference to mankind, the sufferings and death of Christ,

like the whole of his ministry, lead to one point, and are in subservance to one great design—their salvation. He came to seek and save that which was lost. God sent him into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. His public ministry had for its object the salvation of his hearers. The Gospel which he made known, is called the word of salvation. Influenced by the same motives as had guided him, and with the same end as he had pursued, throughout his life and ministry, he patiently submitted to his painful and ignominious death. His Apostles, commissioned by him, carried forward the same design after his ascension. They called sinners to repentance; they held forth the word of life; they preached the forgiveness of sins; they testified the resurrection of Jesus; and in connection with it, the resurrection of all the dead; they published the same doctrine as he had before them, their whole ministry had the same object as his, the salvation of men. As Christ in dying had this important object in view, and his death so eminently subserves it, he is said to have died for them, to have died for their sins, and they are said to have redemption, through his blood. Yet it is by a knowledge of his Gospel, and its influence upon their hearts, they are actually saved; but it was by his obedience to death he confirmed that knowledge to them, and as the reward of that obedience, he received authority to communicate it to the Gentiles, with all its blessings accompanying it. Hence it is true, that he died for our salvation.

Dr. Bruce, in his sermon on the Atonement, points out some important moral distinctions that are overlooked by the advocates of a literal atonement by blood.

He thus expresses himself: "It is necessary to point out the diversities of signification, to guard you against being misled by popular misinterpretations; for on some of the senses in which these words are taken, have been chiefly erected the doctrines of imputed righteousness and vicarious punishment. As the divines have plunged mankind into such an abyss of degradation and misery, by the imputation of Adam's guilt, it was but

"reasonable and equitable that they should have made them
 "sharers in the merits of Christ: and as mercy is entirely
 "banished from their scheme, and they deny to the Almighty
 "the privilege of free grace, or a gratuitous forgiveness of sins,
 "they were also obliged to lay the fault of our sins upon our
 "blessed Lord, that he might atone for them. But guilt and
 "punishment, transgression and reward, are always personal.
 "No man can partake in the guilt of another. A father may
 "suffer by the extravagance and depravity of his son, and a son
 "by the misconduct of his father, but cannot be *punished* for
 "it. Subjects may *suffer* by the vices of kings, and we all
 "suffer by the transgression of Adam; but his *guilt* is never
 "said in Scripture to be imputed to his posterity. Punishment
 "and suffering imply very different ideas. Punishment is
 "suffering, but suffering is not always punishment; for punish-
 "ment supposes guilt. Christ may have *suffered* on our ac-
 "count, but could not be *punished*, because in him was no sin."

With respect to the church of God, many important ends are
 effected by the death of Christ. By confirming the new dis-
 pensation, and establishing its ministration, he has redeemed, or
 delivered back, the church from under the law, or dispensation
 of Moses, with all its curses; and fully introduced them to the
 superior light, liberty, and privileges of the Gospel. Hence it
 is said—*When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth*
his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them
that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of
sons. Gal., 4 c. 4—5 v. By confirming the Gospel with all
 its influence, especially to the Gentiles, who before were without
 strength, he hath afforded them all the information, motives,
 divine assistance, and strength necessary for them to become a
 holy people. Hence it is said—*He gave himself for us, that he*
might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a
peculiar people zealous of good works. Tit., 2 c. 14 v.; and
 that he *loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might*
sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word,
that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not hav-

ing spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. Eph., 5 c. All this he does by the influence and operation of the Gospel upon those who believe; but he is said to have given himself for the Church, that he might do it, because he gave himself to confirm the Gospel to them, by which it is effected.

Thus it appears, that we derive many and great blessings from the death of Christ, and an important design, to effect which he did, is discoverable, independent of the notion of his making satisfaction for sins. It is irreverent, and discovers great inattention to the Scriptures, for men to say, that if Christ did not make atonement* to Divine Justice for our sins, we derive no benefit from his death. To the Gospel with all its blessings no benefit? Is it no benefit to have the doctrine of immortality ratified, and made plain to the meanest capacity? Is it no benefit to have the strongest confirmation of all the divine promises? Is it no benefit to have salvation brought to us, and all the means of enjoyment placed before us? Is it no benefit to have all the means of becoming holy and happy? If these be benefits, and surely they are of great value, it follows that we derive many great benefits by the death of Christ. Is nothing to be thought a benefit but our having him to be righteous in our place and stead, and his righteousness transferred to us? Will nothing satisfy us but an impunity in sin? Alas! were the benefits so much contended for by those who believe in the doctrine of the Atonement real, they would do us no good. Whilst it continues true that there is no peace for the wicked, it matters not whose righteousness is imputed to us; it can never give us solid happiness. And if we be made truly righteous in our own per-

* The word Atonement occurs only once in the New Testament, and in the margin it is rendered by the translators, *reconciliation*, which is, in fact, the true rendering of the Greek word. vide Rom. 5 c., 11 v., "We also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the Atonement." Or, as it ought to be rendered, "*reconciliation*." It is therefore surprising how men can from hence suppose, that God received a price for our reconciliation to himself, when it is positively asserted that *we*, i.e. the children of men, received the reconciliation.

sons, the imputation of the righteousness of another will be superfluous. Instead, therefore, of amusing ourselves about imaginary benefits of the death of Christ, which the Scriptures know nothing of, we ought to avail ourselves of the solid advantages afforded us through his death : and labour to attain that purity and holiness of heart and life, that devotedness to God, and usefulness to men, to which the Gospel, confirmed to us by his death, is calculated to lead us. No further than we become like Christ, in our views and motives, temper and conduct, can his death savingly benefit us.

We are taught by the Apostle John, that "God is love," and this declaration, one of the most heart-encouraging in the Scriptures, is opposed to the favorite creed of those, who are generally more lavish of their abuse, which teaches, that "God is wrath," unappeasable except by an infinite atonement ; although nothing can be clearer than that man, being a finite creature, incapable of anything infinite, cannot commit an infinite offence.

We are required, in devout and cordial sympathy with this text *to love God*. Dr. Young has well observed, "Love and love only is the loan for love." And the Apostle has very appositely, said (1 John, 4 c., 19 v.) "We love Him, because He first loved us." No impossibilities are enjoined upon mortals. But, it is impossible to love an invisible being, without a fixed, unhesitating persuasion that he loveth us. Who, and what description of persons, are thus required to love God ? All and every one to whose knowledge, through the medium of the Gospel, the requisition may extend : in other words, and in the course of ages, all mankind. Then the injunction implies his universal love, co-extensive with the love that He requires.

It has been imputed to Unitarianism—as a beacon, it is presumed, to hapless mortals tending hitherward—that it is a cold and heartless profession,—that its meagre faith supplies no cheering hopes, no consolation upon a death-bed.

What ! no consolation in the firm assurance that "God is love ;" that our voucher for it is unimpeachable ;—that his tender mercies prevail over, and pervade all his works ;—and

in no instance so eminently, as in the paternal mission of Jesus, to certify a resurrection from the death impending?

No consolation, that we are passing into the hands of "*Our Father* who is in heaven;"—into his hands, whose high pleasure it was to create us frail, and whose characteristic *love* must necessarily incline him to treat our frailties leniently;—whose nature can be disinclined to none but the stubborn, unreluctant sinner; nor to him but for a season, and with the gracious purpose of reclaiming him?

Can he be void of a death-bed consolation, who has been accustomed to regard, and look up to his Creator, as anxious (if the expression be consistent with his attributes) for the happiness of all his rational offspring, as loving them universally and impartially, and because he has created them; who has a thousand times announced his placability to sinners, exacting no other atonement for offences, than a sincere repentance, exemplified in purified morals and corresponding habits of life?

Say rather, that the Unitarian, under the influence of his habitual trust in such declarations, might in his extremity sing a song of triumph, when the devoutest professors of orthodoxy—*ceteris paribus*—in respect to the purity of their lives—might be weighed down with oppressive forebodings, the result of his lower estimate of the Divine character!

The inconsistent charge has also been brought against the Unitarians, that they respect too lightly the threatenings of Divine vengeance,—fritter away their literal import, and repose too rashly, and even presumptuously, on the assurances of Divine love, abounding as they confessedly are.

But is that an argument against Unitarianism "*supplying* "consolation upon a death-bed?" The assumption is a *non sequiter*, so palpable as to induce a smile. The converse might fairly be argued; leaving the question open, as to the correctness of Unitarian apprehensions on the subject.

No! let us receive our Apostle's repeated axiom—with the humblest and warmest gratitude receive and cherish it—in its genuine sense, that God's love to mankind is a feeling, which

his power enables him to gratify ; that, as the declaration of it is absolute, his love must be unlimited ; and, whatever presuming mortals, (men who would appropriate the Divine mercy), may suggest to the contrary, let us rest in the conviction, that the God who is love, views, in his boundless survey of the universe, the whole human race with undisturbed complacence, and with an equal regard to their eternal welfare.

Considering the stress laid in the Scriptures upon the article of *faith*, and the saving merit ascribed to it, of which these examples may suffice :

“ *As thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee ;* ” —

“ *Thy faith hath made thee whole ;* ” —

“ *Thy faith hath saved thee ;* ” —

And, considering the Unitarian's faith in the Divine benignity, even were it not overweening, appears so consonant to the spirit of the Gospel, it would be difficult to conceive how it can be imputed to him for unrighteousness.

Ill betide—the sainted bigot, who would divest him of his faith on the verge of eternity !—It may be more charitable to add—Enlighten, O God ! the mind so clouded, as to question its efficacy in our departing moments !

And if to set forth the Divine Author of our being, not as a God of wrath and inexorable vengeance, but as the providential, tender, and compassionate parent of all his creatures, be *impious*, —as Unitarianism has likewise been stigmatized by its opponents—it must plead guilty to the charge ; yet the volume of nature which is open before us, the voice of reason within us, all unite to assure us that *He is love* ; and though Unitarianism may want the heat of enthusiasm, and the blind zeal of bigotry, yet it can be only accounted *impious* by those who would measure its claim to truth by the standard of their own opinion, rather than by the word of God.

When the merits of the Unitarian and Trinitarian doctrines are compared, the advantage manifestly appears in favour of the former, for it is not only consistent with the light of reason, the works of nature, and the discoveries made to us by Divine reve-

lation, but has further to recommend it ; i. e., being clear and intelligible, is adapted to the meanest capacities ; and, for these reasons, is eminently calculated for the belief of all mankind. A religion of which God is the author, and the populace the object, must be, in all its fundamentals, plain, simple, and level to the understanding of the most illiterate, needing only to be fairly proposed, in order to be assented to. But the Trinitarian doctrine can have no claim to these characters, therefore, cannot be the necessary, and fundamental doctrine of Christianity, being dark, obscure, and unintelligible, above the comprehension of mankind, and is acknowledged, even by its advocates, to be a mystery and beyond comprehension. The utter inability of man to do the will of God, and the total corruption of his nature, through the sin of Adam, whether as taught in the articles of the Established Church, or, in the Assembly's Catechism, is not only irreconcilable, but directly contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures. In the same light may be viewed the Calvinistic doctrines of election and reprobation, as implicating the most unworthy notions of God, and the most unjust reflections on his infinitely amiable and all perfect character. God forgives the sins of his penitent offspring freely, without looking to an equivalent to hire him to show mercy ; that he has declared this his determination, freely to pardon repenting sinners by his beloved Son Jesus Christ ; and that this is the view which the Apostle Paul affords us of the matter, when he says (Rom. 9) " We joy in God, " through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom *we* have now received the atonement,"—or, as in the margin, " reconciliation."

Religion has for its object, the moral care and the moral cultivation of man. " All things whatsoever ye would that men " should do unto you, do you even so to them, for this is the " law and the prophets." The Redeemer taught men to look and rely on their works for salvation, and confirmed his doctrine, by this most plain, and most impressive declaration :—" For the " Son of man, shall come in the glory of the Father, with his " Angels, and then he shall reward every man *according to his works.*" The sole end of religion is the love of God and one's

neighbour ; this comprehends all virtue, and there is no mystery in it whatever.

Finally—It is known to the merest tyro on the subject of prophecy, that it was predicted there should be a falling away of the truth, which should continue for a long period of time ; that the principal feature of this falling away should be a *love of mystery* : but that it should at last be destroyed, and all the nations brought into the kingdom of God, and under power of his Christ. If Trinitarianism be the truth as it is in Jesus, then the prophecy is not only not yet accomplished, but it is absolutely and completely falsified. But if Unitarianism be the doctrine of the Gospel, if that be the faith once delivered to the Saints, then the prophecy has already been in part fulfilled, there has been a falling away, and a grievous falling away of the truth ; unscriptural doctrine has covered the earth for many ages, and the remainder of the prophecy shall eventually receive its full accomplishment. The small still voice of reason and of Scripture is even now beginning to prevail ; error and superstition shall vanish like the morning cloud and the evening dew, which soon passeth away ; the truth of prophecy shall be vindicated, and the name of the Lord shall be one, and his praise one, throughout the earth.

A few brief Observations on the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, as distinguished from his Diety.

The head of every man is Christ ; and the head of Christ is God. Paul.

In the discussion of religious subjects, especially such as are controversial, words should be used with the greatest precision. The want of this has produced many mistakes. The words, the *Diety of Christ*, must relate to his person, and mean that he is God by nature. The phrase, the *Divinity of Christ*, may have the same, it may also have a very different meaning ; it may have no relation to his abstract nature or person ; but simply to

something which he hath received of God, or to some relation in which he stands to others; consequently, divinity may be ascribed to him, though in his person he be simply a man. All Christians believe in the *divinity* of the mission of Jesus, and of the Gospel; yet they would think it absurd to talk of the *Deity* of the mission of Jesus, and of the *Deity* of the Gospel. In speaking on these subjects they distinguish between divinity and proper deity; no one supposes that by the divinity of the mission of Jesus, and of the Gospel, can be meant either that his mission is God, or that the Gospel is God; only that both being from God, are of divine authority. Why should not the same distinction be made when divinity is ascribed to our Lord Jesus Christ? In the latter case, the words *divinity* and *deity* are commonly regarded as synonymous. Those who deny our Lord's deity, are supposed to deny his divinity under every view, to represent him merely as a common man, destitute of every thing divine. This misconception does great injustice to a respectable body of Christians, and is prejudicial to the cause of divine truth. To explain this matter, and place it in a Scriptural light, is the object of the following remarks.

Those Christians who maintain the strict unity of God, and, of course, reject the proper deity of his Son Jesus, have been much employed in refuting errors which they think subversive of the true Christian doctrine. At length the way seems prepared, by the labours of many learned and excellent men, for them to dwell more on their own sentiments, without noticing the objections and arguments of others. Whatever may have been asserted to the contrary, it is their aim to exalt their great and venerated Master, as far as is consistent with the peerless majesty, absolute supremacy, and incommunicable glory of God the Father, and with the plain facts and declarations of sacred Scripture. So far from wishing to pluck the smallest gem from his crown, to shade a single ray of his brightness, or in the least degree to diminish his authority, they long and pray for the happy time when, *in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess he is Lord, to the glory of God the*

Father. To accelerate this glorious period, they are anxious that spiritual views of his divinity may be universally diffused and embraced.

His divinity is comprehended in the following particulars : —

The Messiahship of Jesus, the authority of his doctrine and precepts, and the stability of the hope he communicated, depend on the divinity of his mission. Whatever he might be in his person, without a divine mission he could not be the Messiah, nor could what he taught have been from divine authority. Having a divine mission, the inferiority of his nature and person lessens not the authority and value of his doctrine.

He declared, *I am come in my Father's name, I proceeded forth and came from God : neither came I of myself but he sent me.* John, 6, 43, and 8, 42. This was an explicit avowal of a divine mission. It was not from the impulse of his own mind, however benevolent ; not from the simple dictate of his own heart, however wise or virtuous ; but at the call of his heavenly Father, as immediately sent by him, he went forth in his public ministry, and became the teacher and Saviour of the world. He received no authority from men, had not the countenance of earthly powers, derived no aid in his work from the arm of flesh ; but spoke and acted in the great name, solely by the authority of God.

The divinity of his mission was not admitted merely on the ground of his own assertions ; it was established by various evident proofs. John the Baptist, who was a beaming and shining light, whom all the Jews viewed as a Prophet, pointed him out as the greatest of divine messengers. His light shone only till this sun of righteousness arose, and filled the land with his brightness. God himself confirmed the mission of Jesus, by the miracles, wonders, and signs he did by him : with his mighty hand he sealed the authority of his messenger. The tone in which our Lord delivered his doctrine astonished the multitude ; for he taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes. Matt. 7, 29. They perceived that he spoke as one fully conscious of his divine mission. Nicodemus declared his

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

Jesus did the works of God ; such works as merely human power could not effect ; as were manifest proofs, because evident effects, of divine power. He said, *The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.*—*Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me ; or else believe me for the work's sake.* John 14, 10—11. That is, believe me on account of the works which it is impossible I could perform, without a divine power. It may be objected, that Christ said, *I and my Father are one.* John 10, 30. He and the Father may be one in design, in testimony, and in care of the Church, without an identity of being. Christ hath illustrated the subject by the union which subsists between the disciples, and between him, and his disciples. Praying for them, he said—*that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.* John 17, 21. The saints are to become one in God and Christ, even as God and Christ are one ; but God, Christ, and Christians, however closely united, never become one individual being ; it follows, therefore, that when Christ said, *I and my Father are one,* he could not mean one being, for Christians are to become one in the same sense, as he and his Father are one. 1st Cor., 3, 8. *Now he that planteth and he that watereth are one.* This clause throws perfect light on the phraseology and import on our Lord's declaration—*I and my Father are one ;*—one in counsel and intention. It is too prevalent a custom, to transfuse the mystical obscurity of a few passages of Holy Writ over the whole. Three of the four Gospels, the Acts, and almost the whole of St. Paul's Epistles, speak of Christ in a plain and intelligible way ; and if in the writings of St. John, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is somewhat otherwise, we ought in reason, to interpret the obscure by the plain sense of Scripture, and not to confound the plain by the obscure.*

* By some, the Received Text, as it stands in 1 John, 5 c., 7 v., may be referred to, in confirmation of the popular doctrine of the Trinity. *For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one.* This text concerning the Heavenly Witnesses is not contained in any Greek

God was with him and in him. *It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell. In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.* Col. 1, 19, and 2, 9. That is, all fulness of gifts, blessings, communications and powers, flowing from God in the most substantial manner. The blessings which come to us by Jesus Christ could not originate in a created course. They flow from the infinite love and mercy of God, and are the riches of his grace. As the beloved of the Father, Jesus was full of grace and truth. John 1, 24. Out of his fulness all the blessings of the Gospel are received. Eternal life could originate in none but the living God ; immortality can flow only from the King Immortal. All the blessings of the Gospel are divine favours, flowing from a divine source, through a divinely appointed medium, are superior to what can be derived from creatures, and designed to produce the divine image in man, and issue in the divine glory.

The divinity of his official character has been stated, it remains to show that his personal character was not less godlike. He was the Son of the Father in truth and love : under a moral view his express image. Heb. 1, 3. He was altogether godlike in his spirit and conduct. The most holy tempers, exalted virtues, and

manuscript which was written earlier than the fifteenth century. Nor in any Latin manuscript earlier than the ninth century. It is not found in any of the ancient versions. It is not cited by any of the Greek ecclesiastical writers, though to prove the doctrine of the Trinity they have cited the words both before and after the text. It is not cited by any of the early Latin Fathers, even when the subjects upon which they treat would naturally have led them to appeal to its authority. It is first cited by Vigilius Tapsensis, a Latin writer of no credit, in the latter end of the fifth century, and by him it is suspected to have been forged. It has been omitted as spurious in many editions of the New Testament since the Reformation:—in the two first of Erasmus, in those of Aldus, Colinaeus, Zuinglius, and lately of Griesbach. It was omitted by Luther in his German Version. In the old English Bibles of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, it was printed in small types, or included in brackets: but between the years 1566 and 1580, it began to be printed as it now stands; by whose authority, is not known. See Travis's Letters to Gibbon, and Porson's to Travis. Archbishop Newcome omits the text, and the Bishop of Lincoln, expresses his conviction that it is spurious. Elem. of Theol., vol. 2, p. 90.

highest excellencies adorned his life. His character was formed by the imitation of perfect goodness, and supreme moral excellence. He left the most godlike example to his followers. In him we contemplate a pattern, formed by the influence of divine principles, in perfect conformity to the divine will, sanctioned by the highest marks of divine approbation, and strikingly illustrative of divine purity and goodness.

Such is the true doctrine of our Lord's divinity. It is the divinity of his mission, his office, his authority and powers, his doctrine, his works, of the fulness which dwells in and the blessings which come by him, of his character, and the example he hath left us.

The divinity of our Lord, as before stated, has no relation to his abstract nature, or what he is in his person merely, but his deity relates to his mere nature and person : it supposes him to be a divine person, truly God. The former is entirely distinct and essentially different from the latter. Whatever divinity is ascribed to him, he derived from, and holds it in dependence on the Father ; to whom he uniformly attributed the glory of all his supernatural powers, attainments, and works : but deity cannot be derived ; it must be unoriginated, or absolutely independent, or it is not deity. *As his divinity consists in what he had derived from God, it is incompatible with his deity : for he, who is truly God, can possess nothing by derivation.*

It was in his public work and ministry he possessed and exercised divine authority and powers. He did not assume his office, and enter on his work, as a divine person, acting by his own independent authority ; but was chosen, appointed, qualified, and sent forth by his God. Matt. 12, 18. John 17, 4. He had not the divine spirit as an essential part of his person ; but it was upon him, because God had sent him to preach the Gospel, to execute the office to which he had called him : Luke 4, 18. God can be appointed to no office ; for who should appoint him ? Had Christ been God, his deity must have superseded his appointment to office, a work could not have been

allotted to him, nor could he have been under the control of, and obedient to, a superior.

It is not necessary a person should be divine in order to his receiving a divine mission ; otherwise Moses, the Prophets and Apostles, must all have been divine ; for they were all divinely commissioned.

As none but God can give a divine mission, none but a creature can receive it. If Christ had been a divine person, truly God, in what need could he stand of a divine mission ? what new authority or powers could he receive ? He who receives a mission, must be a distinct being from him from whom he receives it, for it would be absurd to talk of any one giving himself a mission. Nothing divine is ascribed to Jesus, in the New Testament, but on the ground of his being raised up and sent of God. He said,—*All things are delivered unto me of my Father.* Matt. 11, 27. These remarks show that as the mission of Jesus proves him a being distinct from God, a created being, capable of receiving what he did not always possess, it excludes the deity of his person.

Infinite power and authority must naturally belong to deity, and be possessed by him without derivation. To such a being there can be no accession of power, no increase of authority. It matters not how great, how extensive the power of Jesus Christ is, so long as it remains an undeniable fact, that it is not underrived, that he received it from God ; indeed, so far from proving his deity, it excludes the idea of it. Had he been God, he could no more have derived power and authority from the Father, than the Father can derive power and authority from him. The power and authority of Jesus are not the less divine because not possessed by him naturally, and independently of the Father ; they are the power and authority of God, given to and abiding in him. The authority is not to be the less revered, nor is the power the less efficacious, because derived.

The divinity of his doctrine and precepts depends on their origin, and the authority by which they were given and sanctioned. Doctrines and precepts which came from God, which

were given by his authority, and sanctioned by evident displays of his power, by whatever messenger communicated, must be divine. The law was not less divine, because Moses was not a God by nature, only by office. What God communicated by the Prophets was not the less divine, because they were merely men. The Gospel was not the less divine when preached by the Apostles, than when preached by their great Master. The deity of Christ's person, could have added nothing to the divinity of his doctrine. When a messenger comes from God, it is not with his abstract nature, but the message he brings, that we are concerned.

For his works to have been a proof of his deity, they must have been wrought by his own independent power; but such a power he disclaimed, by declaring he could of his own self do nothing. The power of God, which was with him, was sufficient to enable him to perform all his miracles; to this power he and his Apostles uniformly ascribed them. The divine works done by the Apostles did not require a less power than those done by Jesus. Whatever powers he communicated to them, he first received from God. Acts 2, 33. His divine works can no more be a proof of his deity, than their divine works are of their deity.

The fulness is the same, in itself, whether derived or underrived. The fulness of God, of powers, gifts and blessings flowing from him, must be divine. The blessings brought to us by Christ, are the same in nature and value, whether he be a created, or uncreated being. If he be qualified to bring us salvation and eternal life, to save and judge mankind, these are the things which most concern us.

The admission of his deity would exclude his exalted piety, perfect obedience, and resignation; for whom should a being who is himself God, worship and obey? to whose supreme will should he be resigned? His virtues are not the less excellent, nor his example the less suitable, on account of his being a creature.

If we find in Christ every thing necessary for our salvation,

to fill us with the hope of eternal life, to make us holy and happy, what more can we desire ? If he be fully qualified for his high office and great work, is it not enough ? His deity cannot be necessary to enable him to perform what God had given him to do ; seeing the Father is with him and in him.

To give the Gospel a divine character, and constitute it a divine revelation, it was not only necessary that he who communicated it should have received it from God, be divinely commissioned to make it known, and that he should speak out and act by divine authority. On this ground its divine origin, truth, and authority are established ; it is evidently the word of God, and worthy to be received and obeyed by all men. On this ground precisely, Jesus and his Apostles claimed the attention of the people, and required them to believe what they taught : not because he was God, but because God had sent him. John 6, 29. Hence he said—*He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me.* John 12, 44. The deity of his person has no connexion with his mission, nor can it add anything to the divine character of his religion.

The importance of the office of Christ arises from its being appointed by the Father, and the nature and objects of it : the efficacy of his ministrations, from the power of God, which operates by him. His supposed deity has no connexion with his official character, no influence on his ministrations as the Messiah, and gives no efficacy to his work. As man, God hath made him Lord and Christ, a Prince and Saviour, the Mediator of the New Covenant, and appointed him Judge of the quick and the dead. Acts ii., 36 v., 31. x., 42. 1 Tim. 2, 5. The fulness of the Spirit, which he hath received, is amply sufficient to qualify him to execute his office, and to accomplish the whole of his work.

The evidences of Christianity have no connexion with the supposed deity of Christ, but are quite independent of it. The divine works which God did by him, his raising him from the dead, and the miraculous gifts communicated to the Apostles, confirm the truth of the Gospel, and establish the foundation of

our faith. In no instance are we referred, in the New Testament, to any operation of the deity of our Lord, as a proof of his mission and doctrine ; but to the miracles, wonders and signs, which God did by a man whom he appointed. Acts 2, 22.

Christ had all blessings to communicate, independently of his supposed deity ; for he received them all of the Father. Mat. 11, 27. It was the ascended man who gave gifts to men : Eph. 4, 8. We are told of no gifts that his deity gave. Through the man, who is Mediator, we receive all the blessings of the New Covenant ; through his deity we receive nothing.

No mention is made that his supposed deity will have any share in the future works of Christ. It is by him as a man, God will raise the dead, judge the world, and execute judgment. John, 5, 27—28—29. Acts, 17, 31.

Thus it appears, that the supposed deity of Christ is unnecessary in Christianity, and has no connexion with it whatever.

The preceding remarks suggest the following short observations :—

1. Unitarian Christians do not deny the divinity of Christ, only what they think erroneous views of it ; as taught in Scripture, and connected with Christianity, they believe and assert it.
2. Those who maintain that Jesus the Christ is the true God, to avoid ambiguity and the misapplication of terms, should use the phrase, the *Deity of Christ*, instead of *Divinity of Christ* ; the latter expression being applicable to his mission, office, doctrine and works ; and not necessarily implying his deity.
3. The divinity of Jesus no more implies his proper deity, than the divinity of Moses, the Prophets and Apostles (the former of whom were called Gods), of their mission, office, doctrine and works, implies their proper deity.
4. The deity of Christ is perfectly consistent with the unity of God, because derived from him ; but his deity is inconsistent with that unity, as it supposes a being, who is distinct from God, to be truly God.
5. His divinity is essential to Christianity, and interwoven

with all its parts ; but his deity has no connexion with any Christian fact, doctrine or precept.

6. The deity of Christ is merely a speculative point, it can have no practical bearing ; but his divinity sanctions and enforces all that he taught and commanded.

And 7. His deity supposes him to be properly a divine person ; but his divinity relates to the supernatural authority, office, and powers given to a man, even to Jesus who was crucified.

The observations that have been advanced in this Tract are concluded by quoting the following remark, taken from a work written by the late celebrated Unitarian divine, Dr. Channing :

“ I have now completed my vindication of the claim of the Gospel to the character of a rational religion ; and my aim has been, not to serve a party, but the cause of our common Christianity. At the present day, one of the most urgent duties of its friends, is to rescue it from the reproach of waging war with reason. The character of our age demands this. There have been times, when Christianity, though loaded with unreasonable doctrines, retained its hold on men’s faith ; for men had not learned to think. They received their religion as children learn their catechism ; they substituted the priest for their own understandings, and cared neither what and why they believed. But that day has gone by, and the spirit of freedom which has succeeded it, is subjecting Christianity to a scrutiny more and more severe ; and if this religion cannot vindicate itself to the reflecting, the calm, the wise, as a reasonable service, it cannot stand. Fanatical sects may, for a time, spread an intolerent excitement through a community, and impose silence on the objections of the sceptical ; but fanaticism is the epidemic of a season, it wastes itself by its own violence. Sooner or later the voice of reflection will be heard. Men will ask—What are the claims of Christianity ? Does it bear the marks of truth ? And if it be found to war with nature and reason, it will be, and ought to be, abandoned. On this ground, I am anxious that Christianity should be cleansed from all human additions and corruptions.

“ If, indeed, irrational doctrines belong to it, then I have no
 “ desire to separate them from it. I have no desire, for the sake
 “ of upholding the Gospel, to wrap up and conceal, much less
 “ to deny any of its real principles. Did I think it was bur-
 “ dened with one irrational doctrine, I would say so ; and I
 “ would leave it as I found it, with this millstone round its neck.
 “ But I know none such. I meet, indeed, some difficulties in
 “ the narrative part of the New Testament ; and there are argu-
 “ ments in the Epistles which, however suited to the Jews to
 “ whom they were first addressed, are not apparently adapted to
 “ men at large ; but I see not a principle of the religion, which
 “ my reason, calmly and impartially exercised, pronounces in-
 “ consistent with any great truth. I have the strongest convic-
 “ tion that Christianity is reason in its most perfect form, and
 “ therefore I plead for its disengagement from the irrational
 “ additions with which it has been clogged for ages. I fol-
 “ low Jesus because he is eminently “ the Light ;” and I doubt
 “ not, that to his true disciple, he will be a guide to that world,
 “ where the obscurities of our present state will be dispersed,
 “ and where reason as well as virtue will be unfolded, under the
 “ quickening influence, and in the more manifest presence of
 “ *his Father and our Father, of his God and our God.*”

Finis.

**ORIGINAL SIN AN IRRATIONAL AND UN-
SCRIPTURAL FICTION,
DISHONOURING GOD AND DEMORALIZING MAN,
An Essay by WILLIAM HAMILTON DRUMMOND, D.D.
Published in 1832, and sold by Hunter, London.**

